Iōannēs M. Phountoulēs

# ANSWERS TO LITURGICAL QUESTIONS

Volume Four

# Answers to Liturgical Questions

## In Appreciation

Publication of this work was made possible
in part through the generosity of:

**John, Tina, and Emmanuel J. Melonakos, M.D.**

and

**FAITH: An Endowment for Orthodoxy and Hellenism**

FAITH
An Endowment for
Orthodoxy & Hellenism

We deeply appreciate and are grateful for their support.

# Answers to Liturgical Questions by Iōannēs M. Phountoulēs:

## A Complete and Annotated Translation

(Based on the 2nd Edition of Apostolikē Diakonia)

Volume 4

Questions 401–500

General Editor and Translator
Patrick Viscuso

Associate Editors and Translators
John Margetis, Anton Vrame

Contributors
Patrick Viscuso, John Margetis, and Stelyios Muksuris

HOLY CROSS
ORTHODOX PRESS
Brookline, Massachusetts

Published by Holy Cross Orthodox Press
Hellenic College, Inc.
50 Goddard Avenue Brookline, MA 02445
© Patrick Viscuso, John Margetis, and Anton Vrame, 2024

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise with the prior permission of Holy Cross Orthodox Press.

ISBN
978-1-935317-90-6 Vol 4 (hardcover)
978-1-935317-93-7 1-935317-93-8 SET

The copyright holder of the books *Απαντήσεις εις λειτουργικάς απορίας* by Ioannis Foundoulis is Apostoliki Diakonia. This translation has been licensed by Apostoliki Diakonia for the First (1st Edition). All rights reserved.

Publisher's Cataloging-in-Publication Data
(Provided by Cassidy Cataloguing Services, Inc.)

Names: Phountoulēs, Iōannēs M., 1927-2007, author. | Viscuso, Patrick, 1956- editor, translator. | Margetis, John, editor, translator. | Vrame, Anton C., editor, translator. | Houpos, Andreas, contributor. | Papiris, Dionysios, contributor.

Title: Answers to liturgical questions by Iōannēs M. Phountoulēs : a complete and annotated translation / general editor and translator, Patrick Viscuso ; associate editors and translators: John Margetis, Anton Vrame ; contributors, Andreas Houpos and Dionysios Papiris.

Other titles: Apantēseis eis leitourgikas aporias. English

Description: First English edition. | Brookline, Massachusetts : Holy Cross Orthodox Press, [2023] | Translation of: Apantēseis eis leitourgikas aporias. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: ISBN: 978-1-935317-93-7 (set) | 978-1-935317-87-6 (v. 1 hardbound) | 978-0-916586-06-5 (v. 1 paperback) | 978-1-935317-88-3 (v. 2 hardbound) | 978-0-916586-19-5 (v. 2 paperback) | 978-1-935317-89-0 (v. 3 hardbound) | 978-0-916586-20-1 (v. 3 paperback) | 978-1-935317-90-6 (v. 4 hardbound) | 978-0-916586-22-5 (v. 4 paperback) | 978-1-935317-91-3 (v. 5 hardbound) | 978-0-916586-27-0 (v. 5 paperback) | 978-1-935317-92-0 (v. 6 hardbound) | 978-0-916586-28-7 (v. 6 paperback)

Subjects: LCSH: Orthodox Eastern Church--Liturgy--History. | Orthodox Eastern Church--Doctrines. | Sacraments--Orthodox Eastern Church. | Orthodox Eastern Church--Apologetic works.

Classification: LCC: BX350.A5 V57 2023 | DDC: 264/.019009--dc23

# CONTENTS

Abbreviations . . . . . vi
Translation of the Original Title Page . . . . . xi
Prologue to the First Edition . . . . . xiii
Questions and Answers . . . . . 1

# Abbreviations

AASS—*Acta sanctorum quotquot toto orbe coluntur* (Antwerp: 1643).

ANF—A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Fathers Down to 325 A.D.*, 10 vols. (1885–1887; Repr., Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1989).

BDAG—Frederick W. Danker, Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

Benešević—Vladimir Benešević, "Отвѣты Петра Хартофилакса," Записки императорской академии наукъ, vol. VIII no. 14 St. Petersburg 1909.

Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins*—René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966).

Cambridge—J. Diggle, B. L. Fraser, P. James, O. B. Simkin, A. A. Thompson, S. J. Westripp, eds., *The Cambridge Greek Lexicon*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021).

CPG—Maurice Geerard, ed., *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, 5 vols. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1974–1987).

Dēmētrakos—Δημήτριος Δημητράκος, ed., *Μέγα λεξικὸν ὅλης τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης*, 15 vols (Ἀθῆναι: ἐκδόσεις Δόμη, 1964).

DOP—*Dumbarton Oaks Papers.*

Galadza—Daniel Galadza, *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

GCS—*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte.*

Goar, Εὐχολόγιον—J. Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον sive Rituale Græcorum complectens ritus et ordines Divinæ Liturgiæ, officiorum, sacramentorum, consecrationum, benedictionum, funerum, orationum, etc. cuilibet personae, statui vel tempori congruos, juxta usum Orientalis Ecclesiae… editio secunda expurgata, et accuratior* (Venice: Bartholomew Javarina, 1730).

Lampe—G. W. H. Lampe, ed., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).

Larin—Vassa Larin, *The Byzantine Hierarchical Divine Liturgy in Arsenij Suxanov's Proskinitawrij*, OCA 286 (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Orientale, 2010).

LBG—Erich Trapp, ed., *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität besonders des 9.-12. Jahrhunderts*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Byzantinistik VI/1-8 (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1994–2017).

*Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarchat de Constantinople—Les Regestes du Patriarcat de Constantinople (Le Patriarcat Byzantine, Série I)*: vol. 1, *Les Actes de Patriarches.* fasc, 1, *Les Regestes de 381 à 715*, by Venance Grumel, ed. Jean Darrouzès, 2nd ed. (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1972); vol. 1, fasc. 2-3, *Les Regestes de 715 à 1206*, by Venance Grumel, ed. Jean Darrouzès, 2nd ed. (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1989); vol. 1, fasc. 4, *Les Regestes de 1208 à 1309*, by Vitalien Laurent (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1971); vol. 1, fasc. 5, *Les Regestes de 1310 à 1376*, by Jean Darrouzès (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1977); vol. 1, fasc. 6, *Les Regestes de 1377 à 1410, by Jean Darrouzès* (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1979); vol. fasc. 7, *Les Regestes de 1410 à 1453*, by Jean Darrouzès (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1991). (References are to the documents, which are numbered in chronological order consecutively throughout).

LSJ—Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. with revised supplement (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).

Mansi—Giovanni Domenico Mansi, ed., *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio.*

Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1—Juan Mateos, ed. and trans., *Le Typicon de la Grande Église. Ms. Sainte-Croix no. 40, Xe siècle. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, Tome I, Le Cycle des Douze Mois*, OCA 165 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1962).

Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2—Juan Mateos, ed. and trans., *Le Typicon de la Grande Église. Ms. Sainte-Croix no. 40, Xe siècle. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, Tome II, Le Cycle des Fêtes Mobiles*, OCA 166 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1963).

NETS—Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

OCA—Orientalia Christiana Analecta.

OCD—Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, eds., *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press).

OCP—*Orientalia Christiana Periodica.*

ODB—Alexander P. Kazhdan et al, eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium,* 3 vols. (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*—Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy,* 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

PG—J.-P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus: Series graeca,* 161 vols. in 166 pts. (Paris: 1857–1866).

RSV—Revised Standard Version.

Rhallēs and Potlēs—Γ.Α. Ῥάλλης καὶ Μ. Ποτλῆς, *Σύνταγμα θείων καὶ ἱερῶν Κανόνων τῶν τε Ἁγίων καὶ Πανευφήμων Ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν Οἰκουμενικῶν καὶ τοπικῶν Συνόδων καὶ τῶν κατὰ μέρος Ἁγίων Πατέρων,* 6 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: Γ. Χαρτοφύλαξ, 1852–1859).

SC—Sources Chrétiennes.

Simmons, *St. Symeon*—Harry L.N. Simmons, trans., *St. Symeon of Thessalonike, Treatise on Prayer* (Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1984).

Sophocles—E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (From B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914).

Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*—Steven Hawkes-Teeples, ed. and trans., *St. Symeon of Thessalonika, The Liturgical Commentaries,* vol. 168 of *Studies and Texts* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2011).

*The History of Byzantine and Eastern Canon Law*—Wilfred Hartmann and Kenneth Pennington, eds., *The History of Byzantine and Eastern Canon Law* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012).

Thomas and Hero—John Thomas and Angela Constantinides Hero, eds., *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents: A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments,* 5 vols. (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2000).

Tolika—Ὀλυμπία Τολικά, *Ἐπίτομο Ἐγκυκλοπαιδικὸ Λεξικὸ τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Μουσικῆς* (Ἀθῆναι: Εὐρωπαϊκὸ Κέντρο Τέχνης, 1993).

Woodfin—Warren T. Woodfin, *The Embodied Icon, Liturgical Vestments and Sacramental Power in Byzantium*, Oxford Studies in Byzantium (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Χρηστοήθεια τῶν χριστιανῶν*—Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Χρηστοήθεια τῶν χριστιανῶν: Περιέχουσα Λόγους ψυχωφελεστάτους δεκατρεῖς, ῥυθμίζοντας ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον τὰ κακὰ ἤθη τῶν Χριστιανῶν. Πρὸς δὲ, καὶ τὰς κυριωτέρας Ἐντολὰς τῆς Παλαιᾶς καὶ Νέας Διαθήκης* (*Morality for Christians: Containing thirteen Orations profiting the soul, which educate to improve the bad morals of Christians. And in addition, also the authoritative Commandments of the Old and New Testaments*) (Venice: Ἐν τῇ Τυπογραφίᾳ Νικολάου Γλυκὺ τοῦ ἐξ Ἰωαννίνων, 1803).

ΘΗΕ—*Θρησκευτικὴ καὶ Ἠθικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια*, 12 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: Ἀθαν. Μαρτίνος, 1962–1968).

ΜΕΕ—Παῦλος Δρανδάκης, ed., *Μεγάλη Ἑλληνικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια*, 24 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: Πυρσός, 1927–1934).

Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυλογίας*—Α. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυλογίας*, 5 vols. (St. Petersburg: Β. Κιρσπάουμ, 1891–1898).

Σταυρινός, *Ἡ Ἱερολογία*—Ἀμβρόσιος Σταυρινός, *Ἡ Ἱερολογία τοῦ γάμου ἀπὸ τὰ τέλη τοῦ Θ΄ μέχρι τοῦ τέλους τοῦ ΙΣΤ΄ αἰῶνος* (Κωνσταντινούπολη: Ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1923).

Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*—Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας*, Texte und Forschungen zur Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Philologie no. 15 (Ἀθῆναι: Ἡ ἐπιστημονικὴ ἐπιτροπὴ πρὸς ἀναθεώρησιν καὶ ἔκδοσιν τῶν λειτουργικῶν βιβλίων, 1935).

Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*—Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 2 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1950–1955).

Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей—А. А. Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, хранящихся въ библиотекахъ Православного Востока, 3 vols. (Киев: Г. Т. Корчакъ-Новицкаго, 1895–1917).

IŌANNĒS M. PHOUNTOULĒS

# ANSWERS TO LITURGICAL QUESTIONS

## Volume 4

## 401–500

2nd Edition

TO MY WIFE
HELENÊ I. PHOUNTOULÊS
MEMORY OF LOVE
(† DECEMBER 3, 1985)

# Prologue to the First Edition

This volume contains the fifth set of one hundred *Answers to Liturgical Questions*, which are published sequentially in the periodical Ὁ Ἐφημέριος. For the completion of this grouping of one hundred, an unusually long time was necessary, an entire decade (May 1, 1982 until March 15, 1993). A three-year suspension of the collaboration also intervened (October 1, 1989 until June 15, 1992), which would have been permanent if the love of many readers did not compel the writer to continue the project. This time showed how labor expended does not go wasted, but with the grace of God something is offered to the great work of our liturgical immersion and is appreciated by many. This constitutes a support and a comfort for the author and some confirmation that he had not run or does not run until now "in vain," according to the Apostle (Gal 2:2). May God's grace complete that which is lacking and heal that which is infirm.

Thus, this volume is submitted for publication as the fifth part according to the former numbering by hundreds, but as the fourth of the new series, following the merging of the first three volumes into two during their republication by the Apostolikē Diakonia of the Church of Greece: Volume 1 (1–150), Volume 2 (151–300), Volume 3 (301–400), Volume 4 (401–500).

With this opportunity, I express my warm thanks to the Administrative Council of the Apostolikē Diakonia, which included this series of volumes of *Answers* in their publications, and to the management of the journal, Ἐκκλησία, which for the past twenty-five years has hosted the continuing publication in Ὁ Ἐφημέριος, from which these five hundred answers have mainly been reprinted.

However, equally warm thanks are due to both the reverend parish clergy and to all others, who with their questions established the content of these volumes, as well as to all those who read them and retain whatever they find in them to be good for their liturgical

formation and whatever they find to be beneficial for the best and most precise celebration of divine worship.

This volume is dedicated to the beloved memory of my wife, whose passing marked the course of its writing. I ask readers to pray for her repose.

I.M.PH.

Thessaloniki, June 28, 1993
on the 141st anniversary of the discovery of the icon
of the Panagia Phanerōmenē
of Kydōnies (Aïvali).
– June 28, 1852 –

# Questions and Answers

## 401

**We know that each service begins with "Blessed is our God..."[1] and concludes with "Through the prayers...."[2] In the Great Compline, two "Through the prayers..." are said in between. Why does "Blessed is our God" not follow after them?**

The assertion, from which the question above begins and upon which it depends, is not entirely correct. In the monastic practice, from which the Great Compline and "Through the prayers..." are derived, neither do the services always begin with "Blessed is our God..." nor also is "Through the prayers..." only used as a conclusion for sacred services.

The services do not begin with "Blessed is our God..." when the priest does not take part in them. This is not as rare as we perhaps might think. In the cells, the service is done very often without a priest. At that time, during the enarxis, instead of "Blessed is our God...," "Through the prayers..." is said at the beginning and not at the end of the service. Moreover, "Through the prayers...," as we have also written elsewhere, is said very frequently at the trapeza of the monasteries and in the everyday life of the monks as a kind of sacred courtesy/prayer, and, indeed, in different variations ("Through the prayers of our holy fathers—of our holy father—of our holy master").[3]

Again, nor do all the monastic services begin with "Blessed is our God...," even if the priest also takes part in them. When one service is appended to another one, it begins immediately after the

1. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός..."
2. "Δι' εὐχῶν..."
3. "Δι' εὐχῶν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν—τοῦ ἁγίου πατρός ἡμῶν—τοῦ ἁγίου δεσπότου ἡμῶν." See question 110.

triple "Come let us worship...,"[4] which constitutes an exhortation towards worship and prayer and serves as a sign for the beginning of a new service. Thus, this is done in the First Hour, which is appended to Matins, and in the Sixth Hour, which is appended to the Third Hour.

Elsewhere again "Through the prayers..." is said in certain monastic services by the priest as an indirect blessing, when he is invited by the reader to bless the people ("In the name of the Lord, father, bless"),[5] instead of the psalmic blessing ("O God have compassion on us...").[6] This is routinely done in instances of welding together two or more semi-independent services. For example, this is done when the Ninth Hour is connected with the Beatitudes and the second part of the service of the typika during Great Lent, and when the Resurrection Service is "done in three repetitions"[7] during Renewal Week. In the first instance, at the end of the Ninth Hour "Through the prayers..." is said and "O God have compassion..." is transferred after the Beatitudes and the remaining elements of the service of the typika. Again, during the Paschal service, which replaces the Midnight Office, the Hours, and Compline, at the end of the first two repetitions, "Through the prayers" is said, but in the final one "O God have compassion...." This case actually is precisely parallel with the Great Compline. Even here, "Blessed is our God..." is said at the beginning of the entire service and is not repeated after each "Through the prayers...," which marks the end of each unit. The second and third repetitions begin immediately with "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ...,"[8] which is the Paschal "Come let us worship...." In an analogous manner, Great Compline consists of three units, three "staseis"[9] (as the Triōdion calls them) or

4. "Δεῦτε προσκυνήσωμεν..."
5. "Ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου εὐλόγησον πάτερ."
6. "Ὁ Θεὸς οἰκτειρήσαι ἡμᾶς..." (Ps 66:1).
7. "τρισσεύεται." In this response, "Resurrection Service" ("ἡ ἀναστάσιμος ἀκολουθία") and "Paschal service" ("ἡ πασχαλινὴ ἀκολουθία") refer to a service as recorded in the Pentēkostarion that replaces the Hours, Compline, and Midnight Office during Renewal Week. See also Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 371, n. 8.
8. "Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι..."
9. "στάσεις."

three "parts"[10] (as Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki calls them: "Therefore, the Complines of holy Lent being thus called great are also divided into three parts as a type of the Holy Trinity and for propitiation on our behalf," *Dialogue*, chapter 343).[11] If there is a priest, the whole service begins with "Blessed is our God...." The first and second "part" or "stasis" end with "Through the prayers..." and the dismissal prayer, but the second and third begin immediately with "Come let us worship...."

And one more thing. It is well known that the services of the Church's daily cycle of prayer essentially come from the Monastery of Saint Sabas in Jerusalem.[12] According to the note in the Typikon

10. "μοίρας."

11. PG 155:620c. Compare the translation in Harry L.N. Simmons, trans., *St. Symeon of Thessalonike, Treatise on Prayer* (Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1984), 68.

12. In discussing the liturgical Typikon in general, the liturgical scholar Robert Taft states, "This type of typikon (τυπικόν) is one of two Byzantine liturgical books with rules governing the celebration of services: where the diataxis gives the rubrics regulating the ordinary structure of services, the typikon indicates what is proper to each day of the year. There are three types of liturgical typikon: the 'cathedral' Typikon of the Great Church for the rite of Hagia Sophia and other secular churches, and two 'monastic' forms, the Stoudite and Sabaitic Typika, which regulated services in monasteries," (Robert Taft, "Typikon," *ODB* 3:2131–2132). See also the brief discussion of the Typika by Phountoulēs at the beginning of questions 67 and 445. Saint Sabas (439–532), born in Cappadocia, travelled to Palestine and eventually established there the monastery of Mar Saba, the Great Lavra of Saint Sabas. On his life and monastic system, see Joseph Patrich, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism: A Comparative Study in Eastern Monasticism, Fourth to the Seventh Centuries*, Dumbarton Oaks Studies 32 (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1995) and Joseph Patrich, "Palestinian Desert Monasticism: The Monastic Systems of Chariton, Gerasimos, and Sabas," *Cristianesimo nella storia* 16 (1995): 1–9. The Typikon and monastic system under his name exercised a wide influence throughout the Byzantine and Slavic worlds and continues to exert a major role in the Orthodox Church. For a general assessment of the influence of Sabaite monasticism and specific studies covering a wide range of subjects, see Joseph Patrich, ed., *The Sabaite Heritage in the Orthodox Church from the Fifth Century to the Present*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 98 (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peters en Departement Oosterse Studies, 2001). The Typikon of Saint Sabas was published in various editions in 1545, 1577, 1603, 1615, 1643, 1685, 1691, 1738, 1771, and 2009. For a discussion of these editions as well as the text of the Typikon of Saint Sabas that will be referenced in the present work (outside of manuscript citations), see Νικόδημος Σκρέττας,

that is inserted for Clean Monday in the Triōdion: "The services of Compline in the Lavra Monastery [meaning Saint Sabas] are not chanted in the church, but each individual reads them in their cells." This private reading of the Great Compline in its fatherland, in the Lavra of Saint Sabas, also explains in yet another way the repetitive use of "Through the prayers…" and the omission of "Blessed is our God…."

## 402

**On the Friday of the Fourth week of the Fast, the canon of the Mēnaion is not chanted, but that of the Triōdion. However, neither at the end nor at the beginning of the third ode does the heirmos exist. Where do we find it in order to chant it?**

## 403

**Likewise, there is no heirmos in the sixth ode of the same canon. However, there is an heirmos of the Triōdion in the fifth ode. Is this perhaps the heirmos of the sixth ode that we must chant, and was it mistakenly placed at the end of the fifth ode?**

Indeed, in the Matins of Friday of the Fourth week of the Fast, the canon from the Mēnaion is omitted (it is chanted "in the Complines") due to the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross. The full canon of the Precious Cross (plagal of the fourth tone, "Come, let us venerate the Cross of the Lord today…"[13]) and the two triōdia of the day (fifth, eighth, and ninth ode) are chanted as usual. At the end of the third and sixth ode, according to the taxis, the corresponding heirmos of the canon of the Cross must be chanted. Both these heirmoi are denoted at the beginning of the odes (third ode,

---

ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012).

13. "Τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου προσελθόντες σήμερον…" The full troparion reads, "Τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου προσελθόντες σήμερον, Σταυρὸν νοῒ καθαρῷ, καὶ εὐσεβεῖ γνώμῃ, δεῦτε προσκυνήσωμεν· πρόκειται γὰρ δωρούμενος, τοῖς αὐτὸν προσκυνοῦσιν, ἁγιασμόν τε σωτήριον, ἔλλαμψιν καὶ δόξαν καὶ ἔλεος."

"In the beginning You confirmed"[14] and sixth ode, "Be gracious to me, O Savior"[15]), but they are not written out fully, neither at the beginning nor at the end of the odes, as they ought to be. Conversely, very correctly, the heirmoi of the third and sixth odes exist in the Mēnaia and Triōdion on other days, even in the parallel case of Wednesday of the Fourth week of the Fast.

The two heirmoi that are missing in our canon are among those most frequently used and for this reason many know them by memory. But this is not the reason to justify their absence here. The liturgical tradition does not require of those who chant to know the hymns by heart. Nor is it guaranteed that those who know them will have at that moment the clarity to remember them and to chant them, certainly without errors. Then there would have existed no need for liturgical books. The heirmoi are found published all together according to tone in a special but relatively rare liturgical book, the "Heirmologion."[16] However, the hour of the service is not the appropriate time for anyone to search in the Heirmologion in order to find the necessary heirmos. For this reason, the heirmoi are found in their place in the Triōdion or Mēnaion or in the liturgical book that the choir uses during that hour. And so, it is usually done. Here, this is an omission, which from the question shows how many practical difficulties it can cause.

The Triōdion especially, a complex liturgical book also associated with many editorial problems, was not subjected to any systematic and serious editorial scrutiny, and this is why it presents many similar omissions. Editorial care is usually limited to the attractive appearance of the book and to the correction of typographical errors, without even this being entirely guaranteed. In this way, old mistakes and omissions are perpetuated. A plain example is not only the omission of these two heirmoi, but also all the heirmoi of the first canon both here and on the Wednesday of the same week, which are necessarily chanted before the troparia of the corresponding odes.

14. "Ὁ στερεώσας κατ' ἀρχάς."
15. "Ἐλέησόν με, Σωτήρ."
16. "Εἱρμολόγιον."

Even a more typical example is the loss of an entire ode (the ninth) in the second triōdion of the Friday of Cheesefare.

Now, as for the second part of the second question: The heirmos of the fifth ode of the second triōdion, "In the night while rising early...,"[17] is not the heirmos of the sixth, which mistakenly came at the end of the fifth ode. It is clearly referring to the subject of the fifth ode (Prayer of Isaiah the Prophet) and it is correctly placed here. All the odes of the triōdia conclude with their heirmos, obviously because in the older practice the triōdia alone were chanted, repeating at the end their heirmoi, as during Great Week. Namely, they did not insert a canon of the Mēnaion, as takes place today. Moreover, here the sixth ode belongs to the canon of the Cross, which is in another tone (plagal of the fourth), whereas the triōdion is in the fourth tone.

Both omitted heirmoi of the canon of the Cross are set out below:

**Ὠδὴ γ'. Ἦχος πλ. δ'.**

Ὁ στερεώσας κατ' ἀρχάς* τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἐν συνέσει* καὶ τὴν γῆν ἐπὶ ὑδάτων ἐδράσας,* ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ με Χριστέ,* τῶν ἐντολῶν σου (*ἄλλη γραφή: τῆς Ἐκκλησίας*) στήριξον,* ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι πλήν σου* Ἅγιος μόνε Φιλάνθρωπε.

**Third Ode. Plagal of the Fourth Tone.**

In the beginning You confirmed* with understanding the heavens,* while establishing the earth on the waters.* Stand me firmly on the rock* of Your commandments [another reading: of the Church], O Christ.* Besides You none is holy,* O only One who loves humanity."

**Ὠδὴ ς'.**

Ἱλάσθητί μοι Σωτήρ,* πολλαὶ γὰρ αἱ ἀνομίαι μου* καὶ ἐκ βυθοῦ τῶν κακῶν* ἀνάγαγε, δέομαι* πρὸς σὲ γὰρ ἐβόησα* καὶ ἐπάκουσόν μου,* ὁ Θεὸς τῆς σωτηρίας μου.

**Sixth Ode**

Be gracious to me, O Savior,* for many are my iniquities;* and bring me up from the deep* of evils, I supplicate.* For I have cried out to You,* and hearken unto me,* O God of my salvation.

17. "Ἐκ νυκτὸς ὀρθρίζοντα..."

## 404

**When there is a special reason (for example, the attendance of a school),[18] is it possible to celebrate a Presanctified also on the other days of Great Lent, namely, on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday?**

According to the Typikon in use nowadays, the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts is celebrated on all the Wednesdays and Fridays of Great Lent, on the Thursday of the Great Canon, and on the first three days of Great Week. In addition, it is also performed during the commemorations of celebrated saints, such as Saint Charalampos (with the Old Calendar), the First and Second Finding of the Head of the Honorable Forerunner, and the Holy Forty Martyrs. In cases of a celebration of local saints, such as Saint Philotheē the Athenian in Athens, Saint Geōrgios of Mytilēnē in Mytilēnē, and so forth, again a Presanctified is performed, if of course their commemoration, as also with the previous ones, does not fall on Saturday or Sunday.[19] According to the Typikon of Saint Sabas, a Presanctified is also done on the eve of the Annunciation on whichever day of the week it falls, except for Saturday and Sunday.[20] The

18. This is referring to the practice in Greece at the time for the attendance at services by an entire school body during certain times of the year, especially during the morning for the Divine Liturgy. Such "field trips" or special events were often coordinated with clergy, who otherwise may have not celebrated a service on that day.

19. On "celebrated saints," see also questions 131, 154, 173, 174, 341, 342, 343, 369, 421, 560, and 595. These are cases when a saint is locally celebrated on his/her feast often out of affinity and spiritual obligation to the saint, when a person has been named after the saint, or when a temple has been consecrated in the saint's name. Question 595 deals with the local celebration of the saint that coincides with a Sunday.

20. Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012), 202–203.

modern Typika of the Great Church (Kōnstantinos[21] and Violakēs[22]) unjustifiably do not provide for the celebration of a Presanctified on this day, even if it is Wednesday or Friday.

Generally, this is the prevailing taxis nowadays regarding the days for celebration of the Presanctified. This taxis originates from the Jerusalemite Monastery of Saint Sabas, as seen from its Typikon and from the Triōdion in use, which itself, also basically represents the practice of this monastery. For this reason, as is well known, in the services of the ordinary days for celebration of the Presanctified (all the Wednesdays and Fridays), Vespers is interrupted at the readings. Namely, these Vespers do not have aposticha, as do Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday. More precisely, the aposticha of the Vespers for Wednesday and Friday (idiomelon and martyrikon) are not omitted, but are placed before the stichēra of "Lord, I have cried to you."[23]

In this taxis for the celebration of the Presanctified, ordinarily on every Wednesday and Friday and exceptionally during the commemorations of saints, anyone can easily recognize the ancient custom of the liturgical synaxes and of the communion of the faithful ordinarily four times a week (Saturday, Sunday, Wednesday, and Friday) and exceptionally during the commemorations of saints which are celebrated on the intermediate days.[24] This custom is also attested to by Basileios the Great in his letter "To the Patrician Kaisaria:" "We indeed commune four times each week, on Sunday, on Wednesday,

21. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874).

22. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921).

23. "Κύριε ἐκέκραξα πρὸς σέ."

24. As an observation, in certain monasteries, Monday has also become a fasting day in addition to Wednesday and Friday in order to honor the angelic schēma. Consequently, complete Liturgies are celebrated on Tuesdays throughout the year outside of fasting periods to provide additional opportunities for holy communion.

on Friday and on Saturday, and on other days, if there is a commemoration of a saint."[25]

At the same time, the custom of the daily celebration of the Divine Liturgy, and consequently of daily communion, was in use, as attested to by many Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, and which Basileios the Great himself commends in his letter above: "Both to commune each day and to receive the holy Body and Blood of Christ is good and beneficial, who Himself says: 'He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life.'[26] For who can doubt that to participate continuously in this life is nothing other than to live fully?"[27] According to the regime in question, the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified was celebrated daily during the period of the Great Lent. Thus, according to canon fifty-two of the Council in Trullo, "the holy Liturgy of the Presanctified" is designated to be celebrated "on all the days of fasting in Great Lent except for Saturday and Sunday and on the holy day of the Annunciation."[28]

But even in the extant Typika of monasteries, the daily celebration of the Liturgy of the Presanctified is either expressly prescribed or implied. For example, the Typikon of the Monastery of Evergetis (*National Library of Athens 788* of the twelfth century) anticipates the celebration of the Presanctified for each day of Great Lent, only apart from the Monday of the First Week: "Thus, on the Monday of the First Week, in the evening, we recite the verses of the 'To the Lord'[29] and a Liturgy does not take place on this day only. But from

25. "Ἡμεῖς μέντοιγε τέταρτον καθ' ἑκάστην ἑβδομάδα κοινωνοῦμεν, ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ, ἐν τῇ Τετράδι καὶ ἐν τῇ Παρασκευῇ καὶ τῷ Σαββάτῳ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἡμέραις, ἐὰν ᾖ μνήμη Ἁγίου τινός," *Basileios the Great, Letter 93*, in *Saint Basile Lettres*, ed. and trans. Yves Courtonne (Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1957), 1:203–204.

26. John 6:54.

27. Basileios the Great, *Letter 93*, in *Saint Basile Lettres*, ed. and trans. Yves Courtonne (Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1957), 1:203.

28. Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:427.

29. The eighteenth kathisma (Psalms 119–133) is called the "To the Lord" ("τὰ Πρὸς Κύριον," or "τὰ προσκύρια," according to certain manuscripts) from the beginning phrase "To the Lord I cried when I was being afflicted..." ("Πρὸς Κύριον ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαί με ἐκέκραξα...") of Psalm 119.

Tuesday on and throughout all of the Great Lent…on each day, we serve the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified."[30]

In addition, the Typikon of the Monastery of Kryptopherrēs[31] prescribes the celebration of the Presanctified on all the fasting days of Great Lent, although it acknowledges the ancient custom that became prevalent in secular churches and in other monasteries, for it to be celebrated only on Wednesday and Friday: "One must know that according to ancient custom the Church does not chant the Presanctified daily during the days of holy Lent, except for two days of the week…, but we…chant Presanctifieds daily, except for Saturdays and Sundays and the feast of the holy Forty Martyrs and the Annunciation" (*Codex Kryptopherrēs AII 7* from the year 1300).[32] However, there are indirect indications also in other Typika. For example, in the *Codex Barberini III 69* from the year 1205, the priest's attention is drawn during the Liturgy of Cheesefare Sunday, "that

30. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 364–365.

31. This is the Monastery of Grottaferrata founded in 1004 and located near Rome.

32. The full text reads, with the portions in brackets that Phountoulēs omitted: "Δεῖ γινώσκειν, ὅτι, κατὰ τὴν παλαιὰν συνήθειαν, ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐν ταῖς τῆς ἁγίας μ'. ἡμέραις καθ' ἑκάστην οὐ ψάλλει προηγιασμένην, εἰ μὴ δύο ἡμέρας τῆς ἑβδομάδος, [εὐαγγέλιον δὲ οὐδαμῶς,]ἀλλὰ ἡμεῖς [διότι ἡ εκκλησία τῆς Ῥώμης καθ' ἑκάστην ψάλλει τελείαν λειτουργίαν,] προηγιασμένα ψάλλομεν καθ' ἑκάστην, χωρὶς σαββατοκυριακῶν καὶ τῆς ἑορτῆς τῶν ἁγίων μ'. καὶ τοῦ Εὐαγγελισμοῦ· [εὐαγγέλιον δὲ ἀναγινώσκεται ἐκ τῶν παραβολῶν τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ἁγίου εὐαγγελίου ὡς προεγράφη (л 113 об)]," Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, 1:908. Phountoulēs is using a form of citation, no longer accurate, under an old location mark, *Codex Kryptopherrēs AII 7*. The modern citation is *Crypt. Γ. a. I.* or *Grottaferrata Γ. a. I.* For discussions regarding the manuscript and the Typikon, see Stefano Parenti, "Manoscritti del Monastero di Grottaferrata nel Typikon dell' Egumeno Biagio II," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 95 (2002): 641–672; A. Turyn, *Dated Greek Manuscripts of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries in the Libraries of Italy*, 2 vols. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972), 1:96–98; E. Velkovska, "Another Manuscript of Joseph Melendytes?" *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 84–85 (1991–1992): 347–353; A. Rocchi, *Codices Cryptenses seu Abatiae Cryptae Ferratae* (Tusculani: Typis Abbatiae Cryptae Ferratae, 1883), 209–211; and M. G. Malatesta-Zilembo, "Gli amanuensi di Grottaferata," *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* 19 (1965): 157–158.

he sets aside three Presanctifieds[33] for the Liturgy of the Presanctified, which he will celebrate on three days of this week: Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday." But the insistence of both the above Typika and many others, and the Triōdion itself, that the Presanctified was not celebrated specifically on Monday and Tuesday of Clean Week "because the entire brotherhood fasts traditionally," suggests that on all the other days the Presanctified was "traditionally" celebrated.[34] The *Barberini III 69* Typikon, which we mentioned above, also adds another reason: "One must know that during two days of the first week of holy Lent, namely, on Monday and Tuesday, the Presanctifieds are not chanted in the monasteries; except that only the bishops and archbishops chant these [on these days] in their dioceses and great churches." Thus, this Typikon provides us yet another witness for the celebration of the Presanctified apart from Wednesday and Friday.

Summarizing this tradition, Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki states that "it has been handed down to conduct" the Presanctified "on the five weekdays." Remembering the ancient custom to celebrate Presanctifieds also on the Wednesday and Friday of Cheesefare and on Great Friday, namely, to celebrate the Divine Liturgy, either complete or Presanctified, on all the days of the year, he adds: "For since the most fearsome and sacred rite [namely, the Divine Liturgy] is above all most necessary also for the salvation of the whole world, it did not seem right that it completely cease, and neither during this so named and being Great Lent...[35] For it never appeared acceptable to the Fathers for any day to pass and not behold the Lord through the Mysteries, through which He Himself also said He is one with us and, 'Behold I am with you all the days until the close of the age'[36]" (*Answer to the Question Fifty-six of Gabriēl of Pentapolis*).[37]

33. Lambs or hosts.

34. Although not formally prescribed, this fasting has included complete abstinence from food for the first three days, even in certain monastic communities today, resulting in the purposeful delay of the first Presanctified to Wednesday.

35. PG 155:904c–904d.

36. Matt 28:20.

37. PG 155:905c–905d.

Therefore, consistent with the canon fifty-two of the Council in Trullo and with the tradition of the Church, which is attested to by the Fathers and the ancient Typika, "not only on Wednesday and Friday, but also on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays the Presanctified Liturgy is celebrated without hindrance by those who so wish,"[38] as Blessed Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain[39] accurately observes, when commenting on the above canon in his *Rudder*. The rubric of the modern Typika regarding the ordinary celebration of the Presanctified on Wednesdays and Fridays of Great Lent does not have the meaning that this impedes its exceptional celebration on the remaining days also. Precisely as the celebration of the complete Divine Liturgy is necessary on the Saturdays and Sundays and feasts of the year, it does not mean that this prevents its celebration exceptionally also on the remaining days of the week.

In this case of the celebration of the Presanctified on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday, the Typikon that applies to the Wednesday and Friday Vespers connected with a Presanctified must be implemented. The aposticha (idiomelon and martyrikon) will be chanted ahead of the stichēra during the "Lord, I have cried to you." On the basis of this rule, very accurately in *Great Lent* by the Basileios Rēgopoulos Publishing House, Thessaloniki 1977, the standard order for "Vespers with Presanctified on Monday, Tuesday or Thursday" has also been included (pp. 385–386).[40]

---

38. Ἀγάπιος ἱερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982), 268 n. 1.

39. Saint Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain (Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης) (ca. 1748–1809), a hieromonk of Mount Athos canonized by the Church of Greece in 1955, was one of the most prolific Orthodox theologians in the modern period. The range of his writings covers almost every aspect of theological study. His most important canonical work, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* [*Rudder of the Noetic Ship of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of the Orthodox*], more commonly referred to as *Πηδάλιον* or *Rudder*, was first published in 1800 and continues to be one of the main collections of canon law presently used in the Greek-speaking Orthodox churches.

40. *Μεγάλη Τεσσαρακοστή* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1977), 385–386.

## 405

**In the village where I serve as priest, according to an old custom they celebrate the Divine Liturgy and the Kneeling of Pentecost in the cemetery temple and not in the parish temple. After the service, they light tapers at the graves and offer various delicacies. How are these things explained and what position must we maintain towards such customs?**

Professor Geōrgios Megas, in his book *Greek Celebrations and Customs of Popular Religion*, second edition, Athens 1963, pp. 208–211,[41] mentions a plethora of popular funeral customs, which are associated with the feast of Pentecost, the Saturday of Souls that precedes, and the feast of the Holy Spirit that follows. They are encountered in very many places under different forms, such as the lighting of tapers at the graves, the offering of flowers, foods or sweets, the "kneelings,"[42] and so forth. He considers them "traditional customs of the ancient worship of the dead" and a survival of the Lemuria three-day idolatrous feasts of the dead (May 9, 11, 13).

The similarities with ancient pre-Christian customs are such that no one can easily deny the close relationship that exists between them and contemporary expressions in honor of the dead, which take place during the three-day feasts of Pentecost.[43] And it is not only confined to these popular customs. The Saturday of Souls before Pentecost is designated on our calendar as a day of common prayers for those who have "fallen asleep." But also, the service of Kneeling itself during the Vespers of Pentecost is not exempt of a funereal character. The first two great prayers of the third kneeling ("O never-failing Spring…"[44] and "O great and eternal God…"[45]) are clearly funereal. The first actually connects the feast of Pentecost with the petitions for the dead: "On this perfect and salutary feast,

41. Γεώργιος Μέγας, *Ἑλληνικὲς γιορτὲς καὶ ἔθιμα τῆς λαϊκῆς λατρείας*, 2nd ed. (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1963), 208–211.

42. "γονατίσματα."

43. In Modern Greece, the Monday after Pentecost is a public holiday resulting in a three-day festive weekend.

44. "Ἡ ἀεννάως βρύουσα…"

45. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ μέγας καὶ αἰώνιος…"

deigning that petitions of atonement for those confined in Hades be accepted, both providing great hope for us, and remission and consolation from the grievous things afflicting them to be sent down from you to the departed."[46] It is known that the ancients also knelt in order to honor the dead and to pray for them to the underworld deities.

Christianity, during its dissemination, implemented a very wise policy. It would replace either Judaic or pagan feasts with Christian ones, giving to them a new meaning. Thus, aside from the Passover and the Pentecost of the Jews, which it Christianized, it also replaced the feasts of the birth of the Invincible Sun with the feasts of the Nativity and the Epiphany of the Sun of Righteousness, of Christ. The subject of the relationship between the feast of the Lemuria with the three days of Pentecost, which almost coincide chronologically, has not been studied. But even if some relationship is proven, this will not be a basis for criticism of Christian worship. During the traditional days of the worship of the dead, the Christians were perfectly able to pray for those faithful "fallen asleep," without this signifying that they adopted idolatrous practices and thus contaminated their pure worship. It is enough for one to read the wonderful service of the Saturday of Souls and the masterful and most theological prayers for the dead of the Kneeling of Pentecost, in order to experience the abyss which separates the rational worship of Christians from the pagan worship of the dead.

As for the various popular funeral customs, which continue by and large ancient pre-Christian customs, still even these remained on the periphery of Christian worship without affecting its spiritual character. People around the world, no matter what religion they have, express in similar ways their worship toward God and their honor for the dead. That which has significance is the meaning which every single religion gives to all of these forms

46. "Ὁ καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ παντελείῳ Ἑορτῇ καὶ σωτηριώδει, ἱλασμοὺς ἱκεσίους, ὑπὲρ τῶν κατεχομένων ἐν Ἅδῃ, καταξιώσας δέχεσθαι, μεγάλας τε παρέχων ἡμῖν ἐλπίδας, ἄνεσιν τοῖς κατοιχομένοις τῶν κατεχόντων αὐτοὺς ἀνιαρῶν, καὶ παραψυχὴν παρὰ σοῦ καταπέμπεσθαι."

and to the manner with which it interprets this universally human language of symbols.

## 406

**I heard in the litany of peace and in the "Among the first..."[47] the words "our father and Archbishop...."[48] In the service books, there is only "our Archbishop."[49] Which is more correct?**

The commemoration of the name of the hierarch—in the diptychs of the Divine Liturgy; in the litany of peace and in the ekteneis of all the mysteries and other sacred rites; in the "Let us pray ..."[50] of the Compline and Midnight Office; and in all other instances—is always done as the manuscripts and the published books of our liturgical press state: "our Archbishop [name]."[51] This we have received and, thus, this has been done in our liturgical practice up until nowadays. Thousands of holy hierarchs and great Fathers have been so commemorated by thousands of priestly and diaconal mouths throughout the twenty centuries of the life of the Church.

In the monasteries, the abbot is commemorated as "father"[52] ("... our father [name] the hieromonk").[53] The use of the same term also for the archbishop is certainly not incorrect, since the hierarch is in fact the father of the local church after God, and clergy and laity are his spiritual children. But this does not justify this modern addition. We have written elsewhere that our sacred liturgical texts are not jeopardized so much by the impious, as much as they suffer from the arbitrariness of those pious ones who literally destroy them with various pious additions of words or even entire phrases. To rep-

47. "Ἐν πρώτοις..." These words mark the beginning of commemoration of the hierarch in the Liturgy.

48. "τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν..."

49. "τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν..."

50. "Εὐξώμεθα..."

51. "τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν [δεῖνος]." The Greek word, δεῖνος (so-and-so), is often parenthetically inserted as a placeholder in prayers and petitions where specific name(s) can be inserted. In the present translation, the word "name" has been used to translate this word.

52. "πατήρ."

53. "...τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν [δεῖνα] ἱερομονάχου."

resent ourselves as more pious than our Fathers is egoism and a sin. The Fathers, who were the composers of the sacred liturgical texts, and all the pious priests who uttered them throughout the centuries, just as the former formulated them, did not have less reverence than us for the high office of the hierarch, nor did they ever think to doubt his fatherhood in the Lord.

We do not doubt that this addition is done from pure motives. Certainly, what does not apply here is that which Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki criticizes in another instance when he writes that "this took place by flattering persons" (*Dialogue*, chapter 220).[54] However, what is completer and more serious than the time-honored phrase "for our Archbishop"[55]? And if we begin additions of such types, where will we stop? According to the same rationale, could not "most reverend"[56] or "most God-beloved"[57] be added? Are not our hierarchs most reverend and most God-beloved?

Likewise, unacceptable is the dictum that the clergy ordained by the one being commemorated add "father"[58] in the petitions. Apart from the fact that something like this is completely unfounded, it introduces improper and contradictory distinctions. Moreover, the diaconal commands do not only pertain to the deacon or the priest who says them, but to the fullness of the Church that is present, clergy and laity. Among the clergy, some may have been ordained by the bishop who is being commemorated, but others may have not, and among the laity no one. It is clear that we are attempting to introduce pedantic and simpleminded distinctions into our liturgical tradition, which are foreign to its serious and plain character.

These points apply to our Byzantine liturgical tradition. Indeed, in other liturgical forms, the commemoration of the hierarch or the patriarch is accompanied by various epithets. For example, in the Jerusalemite Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos the Brother of God,[59] the local

54. PG 155:433a.
55. "ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν."
56. "σεβασμιωτάτου."
57. "Θεοφιλεστάτου."
58. "πατέρα."
59. These epithets are found throughout this Liturgy, B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduc-

bishop is commemorated as "most blessed father"[60] or "holy father"[61] or "all blessed Archbishop"[62] and the patriarch as "most holy Patriarch."[63] Moreover, in the Alexandrian Liturgy of Saint Markos, the petitions for the patriarch of Alexandria encompass a series of titles: "our most holy and most blessed hierarch Pope [name]"[64] or "our hierarch, Pope Abba [name], pope and patriarch, lord, archbishop of the great city of Alexandria."[65] For Jerusalem it can be recognized that the patriarch there is also combined with the capacity of abbot, the "father"[66] of the monastic Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulchre. The same applies to the archbishop of Sinai, from where many manuscripts of this Liturgy originate. For Alexandria, the historical reasons are known that prompted the attempt of showcasing the patriarch of this city.

Professor Archimandrite Vasileios Stephanidēs of blessed memory writes in passing somewhere in his *Ecclesiastical History*: "When people lose things, then they pay attention to titles" (second edition, Athens 1959, p. 440).[67] The Byzantine liturgical tradition, which never lost "things," remained faithful to the ancient simple plain form of the commemoration of the hierarch: "our Archbishop."[68] May our generation not aspire to destroy it.

---

tion latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 56, 57 (see notes), 60, 72, 94.

60. "ὁσιώτατος πατήρ."

61. "ἅγιος πατήρ."

62. "πανόσιος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος."

63. "ἁγιώτατος πατριάρχης."

64. "τὸν ἁγιώτατον καὶ μακαριώτατον καὶ ἀρχιερέα ἡμῶν πάπαν τὸν δεῖνα." See the editions of Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 3′ (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 27; Geoffrey J. Cuming, ed., *The Liturgy of Saint Mark*, OCA 234 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990), 8.

65. "τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ἡμῶν πάπα ἀββᾶ τοῦ δεῖνος, πάπα καὶ πατριάρχου, κυρίου, ἀρχιεπισκόπου τῆς μεγάλης πόλεως Ἀλεξανδρείας." See the editions of Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 3′ (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 37; Geoffrey J. Cuming, ed., *The Liturgy of Saint Mark*, OCA 234 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990), 12, 116.

66. "πατρός."

67. "Οἱ ἄνθρωποι ὅταν χάνωσι τὰ πράγματα, τότε δίδουσι σημασίαν εἰς τοὺς τίτλους," Βασίλειος Στεφανίδης, *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἱστορία*, 2nd ed. (Ἀθῆναι: Ἀστήρ, 1959), 440.

68. "τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν."

## 407

**In the absence of a priest, is the Service of the "elevation of the Panagia"[69] permitted in women's monasteries to be celebrated by the abbess of the holy monastery?[70]**

The "elevation of the Panagia" at the end of the trapeza in the monasteries of the Holy Mountain is not done either by the ephēmerios or by the abbot. The refectioner[71] of the monastery does the elevation, not only in the absence of an abbot and when priests are not present, but also in the presence of an abbot and priests. Women's monasteries, which follow the Typikon of the Holy Mountain, maintain the same taxis. The "elevation of the Panagia" is also done there by the refectioner, and both the abbess and the ephēmerios (if he happens to be present) attend. This is also the correct thing, not only because the venerable and precise taxis of the monasteries and that of the Holy Mountain require it, but also because our liturgical tradition attests to it.

The ancient Typika and Hōrologia record that the "elevation of the Panagia" is performed by the "designated brother"[72] or "designated monk"[73] or vaguely by the "one who will elevate the Panagia."[74] It never states that the priest or abbot does this. Saint Symeōn

---

69. "ὕψωσις τῆς Παναγίας." For additional background on this service, see John Yiannias, "The Elevation of the Panaghia," *DOP* 26 (1972): 225–236; and *Τάξις καὶ ἀκολουθία τῆς τραπέζης ὡς εἴθισται εἰς τὰς Ἱ. Μονὰς τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὄρους* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: ἐκδίδεται ὑπὸ τῶν ζηλωτῶν ἁγιορειτῶν πατέρων, 1980).

70. The question may have been prompted by a perceived similarity to the elevation of bread (antidōron) that takes place after the consecration of the holy gifts during the Divine Liturgy. The trapeza is the common meal of the monasteries. After being "elevated," the bread in question (Panagia) is offered to all attending the meal, which is often accompanied by the chanting of "It is truly meet..." (Ἄξιόν ἐστιν...). In some monasteries on Mount Athos, when there are non-Orthodox visitors, care is taken to serve them after the general meal likely because the trapeza is being viewed as an extension of the common prayer from the sacred services that have just been concluded. The "elevation of the Panagia" takes place on Sundays and feasts, but usually not on other days.

71. "τραπεζάρης."

72. "ταχθεὶς ἀδελφός."

73. "ταχθεὶς μοναχός."

74. "μέλλων ὑψῶσαι τὴν Παναγίαν."

of Thessaloniki, in his wonderful commentary on the service of the "elevation of the Panagia" (*Dialogue*, chapters 357–359),[75] states that the elevation is done by "the one who reads [during the trapeza] and serves the brothers spiritually" (chapter 359).[76] According to Saint Markos Eugenikos, the elevation is done "by the one [monk] designated for this" (*Explanation of the Church's Daily Office*).[77]

Therefore, consistent with the above and contrary to whatever the aforementioned question implies as correct practice, the "elevation of the Panagia" in women's monasteries must be performed by the "sister appointed to this,"[78] the refectioner or the reader, and not by the priest or the abbess.

In our Euchologia, there is an especially developed "Service of the elevation of the Panagia, when one is about to leave on a journey."[79] This is performed by a priest and is related to the service of the "elevation of the Panagia," which is done in homes during feast days. However, a special question has been submitted concerning this, and this will concern us later.[80]

---

75. PG 155:661d–669c.

76. PG 155:665a. This may be a contrast to those who serve the brothers bodily by preparing and serving the food. Cf. the translation in Simmons, *St. Symeon*, 98.

77. Saint Markos Eugenikos, *Ἐξήγησις ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας* [*Explanation of the Church's Daily Office*] (PG 160: 1184c). Saint Markos Eugenikos (Μάρκος ὁ Εὐγενικός), (ca. 1392–1445), Metropolitan of Ephesos (r. 1437–1445), became the chief theological spokesman for the Orthodox legation at the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–1439), where he refused to sign the decree of union with the Roman Catholics. He is the author of an extensive number of theological, polemical, exegetical, liturgical, and spiritual works, as well as letters, most of which remain unedited and scattered in manuscripts. This brief overview is based on the extensive study, Nicholas Constas, "Mark Eugenikos," in *La Théologie Byzantine et Sa Tradition*, ed. Camello Giuseppe Conticello and Vassa Conticello (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2002), 2:411–475.

78. "εἰς τοῦτο τεταγμένην ἀδελφήν."

79. "ἀκολουθία ὑψώσεως τῆς Παναγίας, ὅταν μέλλει ἀποδημῆσαι τις ἐν ταξειδίῳ."

80. This question does not appear in later answers.

## 408

**At the beginning of the Divine Liturgy, the Hieratikon states: "The priest exclaims all the deacon's parts (when such one is not there) with the exception of 'Bless, Master.'[81]" Does the priest say, "And those whom each one has in mind, and of all men and women"[82] when a deacon is not present, given that this exclamation is the conclusion of the diptychs, which the priest does not commemorate?**

Recently, we dealt extensively with the subject of the diptychs during the prayer of the holy anaphora in the Divine Liturgy, in connection with a similar question (number 400). There, to the question of the exclamation by the priest at the conclusion of the diptychs ("And those whom each…"), based in fact upon the above quoted standard rubric of the Hieratikon, we have taken precisely the opposite position from that which the question formulates.

We recognize that the inquirer is correct. The conclusion of the diptychs, inasmuch as the diptychs are not read, is something logically inconsistent — so to speak, an exclamation without a prayer (although such examples are not rare in the modern form of our services). If a deacon does not concelebrate, the diptychs are not read. How then can their conclusion be read? Perhaps this is the reason which, despite the pertinent (indisputably poorly written) standard rubric of the Hieratikon, most priests do not say "And those whom each…," following instead a more precise tradition. And something else: "And those whom each…" without the verb "remember [O Lord]"[83] says nothing.

May it be permitted for us to insist that, in spite of all of the above, "And those whom each…" must be said by the priest when he serves alone without a deacon, even if the reading of the diptychs did not precede. The priest has already read the diptychs during the proskomidē and he has commemorated any names "as desired" of the living and the departed in the prayer of the anaphora. "In

81. "Εὐλόγησον, δέσποτα."
82. "Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν."
83. "μνήσθητι (Κύριε)."

this manner," we wrote in the other answer, "the faithful are also exhorted to commemorate their beloved persons 'in mind'[84] at the appropriate time."[85] The absence of the verb is made up for in the previous exclamation, of which it comes as a continuation: "Among the first, O Lord, remember our Archbishop...and those whom each has in mind, and of all men and women."[86]

## 409

**In the service of marriage, irrelevant or almost irrelevant troparia are chanted. Are there no special troparia for this service, or if they do not exist, why are new ones not written so that the celebration of this mystery may be properly adorned?**

We have dealt with this subject in connection with other questions previously (see chiefly questions 96, 98, and 99) and recently (question 348).

In fact, there does not exist any special hymnography for the service of marriage. This is explained historically by the liturgical structure and provenance of this service, which is clearly parochial. The monastic services are distinguished for the plethora of troparia that were incorporated into them by the sacred hymnographers, who were mainly monks. It was natural for the subject of marriage to remain outside of the subjects that interested them. The parish services almost only have psalms or very brief and simple hymns, which the people can understand, commit to memory, and chant. The blessing of marriage contains enough such elements, even if some of them have fallen into disuse today. If they are utilized, they give sufficient biblical adornment. For example, the entrance Psalm 127, "Blessed are all who fear the Lord..."[87] with the short festive ephymnion, "Glory to you, our God, glory to you,"[88] the beautiful

84. "κατὰ διάνοιαν."
85. See question 400.
86. "Ἐν πρώτοις μνήσθητι Κύριε, τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν... Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν."
87. "Μακάριοι πάντες οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν Κύριον..."
88. "Δόξα σοι, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, δόξα σοι."

verse "O Lord our God, crown them with glory and honor"[89] (compare Ps 8:6b), the prokeimenon (Ps 20:4b–5), the allēlouarion (Ps 11:8), and the koinōnikon for the Mother of God, "I will take the cup of salvation ..."[90] (Ps 115:4).

However, the prevalence of troparia in other services also created a familiarity and love of the people toward them. Thus, the need of filling certain gaps in the service of marriage, such as the kissing of the crowns and the travelling in procession to the home of the newlyweds, prompted the introduction of troparia, mainly theotokia, which come on loan from other services, since there were no specific hymns for marriage. Generally, the three troparia that accompany the sacred dance became prevalent ("Isaiah dance...,"[91] "Holy martyrs...,"[92] "Glory to you O Christ God..."[93]), whereas the use of others varies according to places and times, as we ascertain from the manuscripts and present-day practice ("The form of your Cross...,"[94] "Today Kōnstantinos...,"[95] "It is truly meet...,"[96] "O full of grace, in you rejoice...,"[97] "The glory of all the world...,"[98] "In the Red Sea ...,"[99] and so forth). However, we must also note that the chanting of many troparia—which indeed are not directly related to the mystery being celebrated—would be inadvisable, on the one hand because this will lengthen the already long service, and on the other hand because it is not certain whether the people will comprehend these hymns and will be able to participate in their chanting.

By way of exception, in very few later manuscripts, some special troparia (also not broadly adopted) are encountered, which were chanted at certain points of the service. These are two series

89. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ στεφάνωσον αὐτούς."
90. "Ποτήριον σωτηρίου λήψομαι..."
91. "Ἠσαΐα χόρευε..."
92. "Ἅγιοι Μάρτυρες..."
93. "Δόξα σοι Χριστὲ ὁ Θεός..."
94. "Τοῦ σταυροῦ σου τὸν τύπον..."
95. "Κωνσταντῖνος σήμερον..."
96. "Ἄξιόν ἐστιν..."
97. "Ἐπὶ σοί χαίρει, κεχαριτωμένη..."
98. "Τὴν παγκόσμιον δόξαν..."
99. "Ἐν τῇ Ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ..."

of troparia/stichēra and an idiomelon. The first series consists of six troparia, which are stichēra of Psalm 127 and prosomia of "House of Ephratha,"[100] in the second tone. They have an alphabetical acrostic (A-Z)[101] and are preserved in *National Library of Athens Codex 668* from the seventeenth century. The other series is found in *National Library of Athens Codex 665* from the sixteenth century and consists of four troparia in the plagal of the first tone, which were probably chanted while travelling to the home of the newlyweds. These have been published by the professor of blessed memory Panagiōtes Trempelas, *Small Euchologion*, volume 1, Athens 1950, pp. 94–95.[102] The idiomelon that was written in imitation of the eleven eōthina doxastika and other similar ones (the Samaritan Woman, the Blind Man, the Paralytic, and so forth) and inspired by the pericope of John 2:1–11, namely, the marriage gospel, is found in *Cairo 149* from the fourteenth century and *Sinai 977* from the sixteenth century.[103] It was published by A. Dmitrievskii, *Opisanie liturgitseskich rukopisej*, volume 2, Euchologia, Kiev 1901, p. 715[104] from the Sinai codex, which was republished by former Metropolitan of Caesarea Ambrosios Stavrinos, *The Benediction of Marriage*, Constantinople 1923, p. 144.[105] This troparion was chanted in the plagal of the first tone, after the gospel.

In the answer to question 96, we spoke about these troparia, referring only to their incipits. Now, in connection with this new question, we publish them in full, slightly corrected, with the hope that they can be used more easily.

100. "Οἶκος τοῦ Ἐφραθᾶ..."

101. Namely, the first six letters of the Greek alphabet (A, B, Γ, Δ, E, Z).

102. Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:94–95.

103. There are eleven eōthina doxastika and exaposteilaria associated with each of the eleven eōthina gospel readings, respectively.

104. Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, 2:715.

105. Σταυρινός, *Ἡ Ἱερολογία*, 144.

**1. Ἦχος β'. Οἶκος τοῦ Ἐφραθᾶ.**

Ἅγιος ὁ Πατήρ,* ἅγιος εἶ ὁ Λόγος,* ἅγιον καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα,* Τριὰς ἡ Παναγία,* τὸν γάμον νῦν εὐλόγησον.

Βλέψον νῦν εἰς λαόν* βοῶντα Θεοτόκε,* καὶ δέξαι τὰς δεήσεις* εὐλόγησον τὸν γάμον* τὸν τῇδε ὦ πανύμνητε.

Γάμον τὸν τῇδε νῦν,* ἀρχάγγελοι Κυρίου,* Μιχαὴλ Γαβριήλ τε,* ἐξ ὕψους ἐποφθέντες* αὐτὸν περιφρουρήσατε.

Δέξαι, ὦ Βαπτιστά* καὶ Πρόδρομε Κυρίου,* λιτὰς τῶν ἱερέων* καὶ γάμον νῦν τὸν τῇδε* εὐλόγησον, πανάγιε.

Εὐχαῖς τῶν ἱερῶν* καὶ θείων Ἀποστόλων,* Υἱὲ Θεοῦ καὶ Λόγε,* ὡς ἐν Κανᾷ τὸν γάμον* καὶ τοῦτον νῦν εὐλόγησον.

Ζωὴν εἰρηνικήν* καὶ μακρόβιον γῆρας* τοῖς δούλοις σου παράσχου,* τοῖς ἄρτι νεονύμφοις,* πανάγιε Νικόλαε.

**1. Second Tone. House of Ephratha.**

Holy is the Father* holy is the Word,* and holy is the Spirit.* O All-holy Trinity,* bless now the marriage.[106]

Look now upon the people* crying out, O Theotokos,* and accept the prayers;* bless this marriage* here, O all-praised one.[107]

This marriage now here,* O archangels of the Lord,* Michaël and Gabriël,* looking down from on high,* shelter.[108]

Receive, O Baptist* and Forerunner of the Lord,* the litanies of the priests* and bless now, O all-holy one,* this marriage here.[109]

Through the prayers of the holy* and divine Apostles,* O Son and Word of God,* bless now this marriage* as the one in Cana.[110]

A peaceful life* and long-lived old age,* grant to your servants* now newlyweds,* O all-holy Nicholas.[111]

---

106. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:94, from *National Library of Athens 665*.

107. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:94, from *National Library of Athens 665*.

108. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:94, from *National Library of Athens 665*.

109. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:94, from *National Library of Athens 665*.

110. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:95, from *National Library of Athens 665*.

111. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:95, from *National Library of Athens 665*.

**2. Τροπάρια. Ἦχος πλ. α'.**

Τοῦ ἱερέως δεχθῆναι τὴν ἱκεσίαν* κατὰ χρέος τὸ θεῖον ἐκδυσωποῦμεν,* συνερχομένου τοῦ κλήρου τῆς Ἐκκλησίας· Υἱὲ Θεοῦ, εὐλόγησον τοὺς νυμφίους,* ἵνα πάντες χαρῶμεν* καὶ δοξάσωμεν τὸν σωτῆρα Κύριον.

Ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ τὸν γάμον* συστησάμενος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις* καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ὑποδείξας* τὴν τοῦ γάμου παιδοποιΐαν,* αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν τοὺς νυμφίους* κέλευσον εὐλογηθῆναι τῇ χειρὶ σου,* ἵνα πάντες χαρῶμεν* καὶ δοξάσωμεν τὸν σωτῆρα Κύριον.

Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ τῆς Ἄννης προσεδεξάμενος τὰς δεήσεις* καὶ χαρισάμενος αὐτῇ,* Σαμουὴλ εἰς παραμυθίαν* αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν τῇ χειρί σου,* κέλευσον εὐλογηθῆναι τὸν γάμον τοῦτον* ἵνα πάντες χαρῶμεν* καὶ δοξάσωμεν τὸν σωτῆρα Κύριον.

Ὁ ἐν Κανᾷ Γαλιλαίας* εὐλογήσας Θεὸς τὸν γάμον* καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ εἰς οἶνον* τῇ δυνάμει σου ἁγιάσας,* αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν οἰκείᾳ παλάμῃ* κέλευσον εὐλογηθῆναι τὸν γάμον τοῦτον,* ἵνα πάντες χαρῶμεν* καὶ δοξάσωμεν τὸν σωτῆρα Κύριον.

**2. Troparia. Plagal of the First Tone.**

Receive the supplication of the priest,* we beseech the divine as is due* when the clergy of the Church come together, * O Son of God, bless the newlyweds,* so that all of us will rejoice* and glorify the Savior Lord.[112]

O God, who established marriage* for human beings* and in it showed* the childbearing of marriage,* command that it be blessed by your hand,* so that all of us will rejoice* and glorify the Savior Lord.[113]

O God, who accepted the prayers of Anna* and granted to her* Samuel as a comfort,* do you the same now, by your hand command that this marriage be blessed,* so that all of us will rejoice* and glorify the Savior Lord.[114]

O God, who blessed the marriage* in Cana of Galilee,* and who sanctified by your power* the water into wine,* now also by your same hand* command that this marriage be blessed,* so that all of us will rejoice* and glorify the Savior Lord.[115]

112. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:94, from *National Library of Athens 665.*

113. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:94, from *National Library of Athens 665.*

114. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:94, from *National Library of Athens 665.*

115. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 1:94, from *National Library of Athens 665.*

**3. Ἰδιόμελον. Ἦχος πλ. α'.**

Ἐν Κανᾷ τῆς Γαλιλαίας* γάμος ἐγένετο παρόντος τοῦ Κυρίου.* Ἔφη ἡ ἄμεμπτος πρὸς τὸν Σωτῆρα·* Οἶνον οὐκ ἔχουσι.* Στραφεῖσα δὲ λέγει τοῖς διακόνοις·* Γεμίσατε τὰς ὑδρίας ὕδατος.* Ὁ δὲ φιλόστοργος καὶ παντοδύναμος Θεός ηὐλόγησε* καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον ἐποίησεν.* Ὦ παραδόξου θαύματος!* Ὦ φρικτοῦ μυστηρίου!* Τίς δύναται ταῦτα ποιεῖν,* εἰ μὴ μόνος Κύριος καὶ Θεὸς Ἰσραήλ,* ὁ ὑπὸ τῶν χερουβὶμ ἀνυμνούμενος* καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν σεραφὶμ δοξαζόμενος* καὶ ὑπὸ πάσης κτίσεως δορυφορούμενος.* Μέγα σου τὸ ἔλεος* καὶ μεγάλη ἡ ἰσχύς σου, φιλάνθρωπε,* καὶ μεγάλη ἡ δύναμίς σου·* δόξα σοι.

**3. Idiomelon. Plagal of the First Tone.**

In Cana of Galilee* a marriage took place when the Lord was present.* The blameless one said to the Savior,* "They have no wine."* But turning to the servants He says,* "Fill the water jars with water."* And they did as they were commanded.* The tender loving and almighty God blessed* and made the water into wine.* O strange wonder!* O fearsome mystery!* Who is able to do these things,* except only the Lord and God of Israel,* the one who is praised by the Cherubim* and glorified by the Seraphim* and who is attended upon by all of creation.* Great is your mercy* and great your might, O lover of humankind,* and great your strength,* glory to you. [116]

## 410

**In the Divine Liturgy, when the priest serves without a deacon, when are the prayers of the antiphons, of the ektenēs, of the faithful, and of the proskomidē, and the prayer before the "Our Father"[117] said? After the first petitions of the synaptes,[118] as they appear in older editions of the Hieratika, or after the synaptes and before the exclamations, as found in modern editions?**

I do not think that it is necessary for us to insist and to prove that there exists an inseparable link between prayers and exclamations. This becomes evident from the comparison of the content of every single prayer with its exclamation, which precisely shows their unity. The prayer formulates the request, and the exclamation glorifies the Trinitarian God in reference to the request of the prayer. Blessed Ni-

116. Ἀμβρόσιος Σταυρινός, *Ἡ Ἱερολογία τοῦ γάμου ἀπὸ τὰ τέλη τοῦ Θ' μέχρι τοῦ τέλους τοῦ ΙΣΤ' αἰῶνος* (Κωνσταντινούπολη: Ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1923), 144, from *Cairo 149* and *Sinai 977*.

117. "Πάτερ ἡμῶν."

118. "συναπτῶν."

kolaos Kabasilas,[119] in his *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, having in view specifically this relationship between prayer and exclamation, calls the exclamation the "reason" or the "rationale" behind the prayer: "He adds the reason for which both he [the priest] asks these things and God might justly grant what is requested,"[120] or "he adds the most fitting reason … and this rationale,"[121] or "when finishing the prayer, [he reads] this rationale, because it is both a conclusion and a doxology"[122] (15.1–6, 21.1).[123] And he is correct, at least in cases where the exclamation has an etiological character and begins with the preposition "for"[124] or with the phrase "for you are"[125] and similar ones. Sometimes even words of the exclamation recall the text of the prayer, as for example in the eleventh prayer of Matins, in the prayer of the trisagion, in that of the funeral, and in many others. In other words, the title of the prayer ("Prayer of the ektenēs," "Prayer of the proskomidē," "Prayer of the Cherubic hymn," and so forth) does not

119. Nikolaos Chamaetos Kabasilas (Νικόλαος Χαμαετὸς Καβάσιλας) (b. ca. 1320–1324, d. after 1391) lived in Thessaloniki as a theologian. His writings on the Liturgy continue to exercise a major influence on Orthodox liturgical thought. The Sources Chrétiennes edition will be used for a text of his liturgical commentary, *Ἑρμηνεία τῆς Θείας Λειτουργίας* (*Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*). The paragraph numbers of Kabasilas's work will be given consistent with the Sources Chrétiennes edition, which differs from those cited by Phountoulēs. For an English translation, see J. M. Hussey and P. A. McNulty, trans., *Nicholas Cabasilas, A Commentary on the Divine Liturgy* (St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1977). For an assessment of his work, see Ἀθανάσιος Ἀ. Ἀγγελόπουλος, *Νικόλαος Χαμαετὸς Καβάσιλας, Ἡ ζωὴ καὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελέτων, 1970) and René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966), 215–244.

120. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 15.1, in *Nicholas Cabasilas: Explication de la Divine Liturgie*, eds. René Bornert, Jean Gouillard, and Pierre Périchon, and trans. Sévérien Salaville, 2nd edition, SC 4bis (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1967), 122–123.

121. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 15.1 (SC 4bis:122–123).

122. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 15.2 (SC 4bis:122–123).

123. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 15.1–6, 21.1 (SC 4bis:122–127, 148–151).

124. "ὅτι."

125. "σὺ γάρ εἶ."

refer only to the prayer, but also includes the exclamation that concludes it. But when the term, ἐκφώνησις (exclamation), is inserted, this does not mean that hereafter it is something distinct from the prayer, but that it signifies the manner of its enunciation, which will be different from the way in which the prayer is read.

The ἐκφώνησις (exclamation) is the doxological epilogue of every single prayer, which is chanted melodically: ἐκφώνως (in an exclamatory manner). Namely, we can characterize the expression, ἐκφώνως (in an exclamatory manner) as a type of musical term, parallel to the phrase ἐκφωνητικὴ ψαλμῳδία (exclamatory chanting),[126] which denotes the mode of melodious reading of sacred texts. In contrast, the prayer constitutes the main body of the text and is read either "εἰς ἐπήκοον" (within earshot) of the people, according to the more ancient taxis, which still applies even today in the sacred mysteries apart from the Divine Liturgy, or "μυστικῶς" (inaudibly), as became prevalent later in the prayers of the Divine Liturgy and of certain other services, namely of Vespers and Matins.

The fact that this is the case is evident also from those prayers which are either read completely "within earshot" of the people (the prayer behind the ambōn, the prayer of the Litē, the prayers of marriage, of holy unction, and so forth) or from those prayers that are read completely "inaudibly" (the prayer of the "kairos," of the Cherubic hymn, of the entrance, of baptism's litany of peace, and so forth), in which a prayer and exclamation comprise one continuous text, which is not interrupted by being said "in an exclamatory manner" (ἐκφώνως) or by an "exclamation" (ἐκφώνησις), precisely because the conclusion/exclamation was not said in a particular way, but was recited according to the general tenor of the prayer.

Logically, therefore, nothing else must be inserted between a prayer and an exclamation, inasmuch as together they constitute a united whole. And this is the case in the great majority of instances. Thus, for example, this occurs in all the services of the mysteries and the other sacred rites; the exclamation follows the prayer. However, there are exceptions. We have seen the special case of the prayers of

126. Such "exclamatory chanting" can be compared to the singing used for dialogue and narrative in operas and oratorios. See also question 551–553.

Lamp-lighting[127] and Matins, where the prayers are read all together during the introductory psalm and during the Six Psalms, and the exclamations are said at their place within the service (answer to question 301). One could even mention the kneeling prayers of Pentecost, where "Help, save..."[128] is inserted between the prayers and the exclamations, obviously in order to give the command to rise ("rise," ἀνάστησον), and the funereal prayer "O God of spirits...,"[129] where "Let us pray to the Lord"[130] is inserted before the exclamation, "For you are the Resurrection...,"[131] possibly because many priests who participated in the funeral and memorial services said this, as also takes place in present-day practice.

However, in the Divine Liturgy, we have a different trajectory both in practice and in texts, manuscripts, and printed editions, which mark this development. From the outset, we can be certain that both a prayer and an exclamation were never separated. We ascertain this from the ancient Liturgies, which all follow this taxis (for example, the Liturgies of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, Saint Iakōvos, Saint Markos, Saint Grēgorios, and so forth). The same also applies for the older manuscripts of the Byzantine Liturgies (of Basileios the Great, the sacred Chrysostomos, and Presanctified). The prayer is not separated from the exclamation. The title of the prayer comes at the beginning (for example, "Prayer of the first antiphon,"[132] "Prayer of the trisagion,"[133] and so forth), its text is added, and afterwards the word "in an exclamatory manner" (ἐκφώνως) and the text of the exclamation (ἐκφώνησις). This is the case in the *Codex Barberini 336* of the eighth century and in other ancient manuscripts.[134]

---

127. Vespers.
128. "ἀντιλαβοῦ σῶσον..."
129. "Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων..."
130. "Τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."
131. "Ὅτι σύ εἶ ἡ ἀνάστασις..."
132. "Εὐχὴ ἀντιφώνου α'."
133. "Εὐχὴ τοῦ τρισαγίου."
134. For the text of the *Codex Barberini 336*, see Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Euchologio Barberini Gr. 336*, Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000).

Corruption of this original and correct taxis was brought about, on the one hand, by the interjection of the deacon coupled with the reading of the prayers inaudibly which gradually became prevalent (already during the era of Justinian in the sixth century we have the first witness to the then condemned tendency of the inaudible reading of the prayers in the Divine Liturgy and in baptism), and on the other hand, by the absence of a deacon, namely, in the celebration of the Divine Liturgy by the priest alone.

The diaconal petitions, which introduced the prayer and framed the petitions of the prayers, were at first very simple and succinct, like those that are preserved in a few instances also in our present-day services, namely, "Let us pray to the Lord,"[135] "In peace let us pray to the Lord,"[136] "Again and again let us pray to the Lord,"[137] or, in a somewhat more developed form, "Upon the offering of the precious gifts let us pray to the Lord,"[138] "Again and again, bending the knees, let us pray to the Lord,"[139] and so forth. However, the diaconal petitions gradually developed, while concurrently the reading inaudibly of the prayers began to prevail. Thus, while the deacon says the petitions of the prayer, the priest simultaneously says the prayer, and the exclamation alone remains to close out a prayer and the diaconal petitions at the same time. Already at two points in the Liturgies of Basileios the Great and the sacred Chrysostomos, according to the *Barberini Euchologion 336*, we have the first witnesses regarding this corruption. The diaconal petitions are not contained in the text of the Liturgies, but it is attested that in the prayer before the "Our Father" and in the prayer "after all partake,"[140] while the deacon said the "prayer"[141] (namely, his synaptē), the priest "prays:"[142] "And when the deacon does the middle prayer, the priest prays, 'O our God, the God

135. "Τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."
136. "Ἐν εἰρήνῃ τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."
137. "Ἔτι καὶ ἔτι τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."
138. "Ἐπὶ τῇ προθέσει τῶν τιμίων δώρων τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."
139. "Ἔτι καὶ ἔτι, κλίναντες τὰ γόνατα, τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."
140. "μετὰ τὸ πάντας μεταλαβεῖν."
141. "εὐχήν."
142. "ἐπεύχεται."

who saves...,'"[143] "And after all have communed, when the deacon says the prayer, the priest prays, 'We give thanks to you....'"[144] More characteristic is the case of the diaconal petitions and the prayer before the "Our Father" in the Liturgy of Chrysostomos: "The deacon, 'Having commemorated all the saints.' The priest inaudibly, 'We entrust to you....' The deacon, 'Help. For the whole day.' The priest, 'And make us worthy....'"[145]

Thus, when the books for the deacon (Diakonika) and for the priest (Hieratika) begin to be put together into a common liturgical text, the prayers typically come after the initial diaconal exhortation ("In peace..." or "Again and again...") and after the text of the prayer the usual diaconal petitions are continued and the exclamation follows, since the priest would have read the prayer simultaneously with the diaconal petitions anyway and would have waited for the deacon to finish in order to say the exclamation.

A greater difficulty existed when the priest celebrated the Divine Liturgy alone, without a deacon. He also said the diaconal petitions by himself. He transferred the corresponding prayers either during the chanting of the antiphons or the trisagion (see the answer to question 260) or the koinōnikon (see answer 311). However, thus, the organic unity of the prayer with its exclamation was broken. And the exclamation, as a strong element because it was said out loud and melodically, retained its original position. The prayer, because it was read inaudibly, was weakened and began to seek shelter here

143. "Καὶ τοῦ διακόνου ποιοῦντος τὴν μέσην εὐχήν, ἐπεύχεται ὁ ἱερεύς, 'Ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ σῴζειν...,'" Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Euchologio Barberini Gr. 336*, Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 17.1, 4.

144. "Καὶ μετὰ τὸ πάντας μεταλαβεῖν, λέγοντος τοῦ διακόνου τὴν εὐχήν, ἐπεύχεται ὁ ἱερεύς, 'Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι...,'" Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Euchologio Barberini Gr. 336*, Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 20.1.

145. This is a summary of text in Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Euchologio Barberini Gr. 336*, Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 38.2–7.

and there, even though this was the essential and main element of the rite.

The publications of the Liturgies followed the corrupted tradition of the later manuscripts. During recent years, in the official editions of the Apostolikē Diakonia, a praiseworthy attempt has taken place of returning to the older correct taxis and the prayers have been rejoined to their exclamations (see the 1977 edition of the Hieratikon, the Small Hieratikon, and the Archieratikon). They must certainly remain there in the editions and must be said there during the celebration of the Divine Liturgy. "Inaudibly" or "within earshot" of the people, is a debatable problem, to which we will return, because relevant questions have long been submitted. In any case, the transfer of the prayers from their correct place is something that must stop happening. It destroys irreversibly the structure of the sacred mystery. The correct and original place of the prayers is precisely before every single exclamation, to which it belongs logically, organically, and inextricably.

## 411

**In the Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great, there is a sentence: "Remember, Lord, my unworthiness according to the multitude of Your mercies; forgive me every transgression, both voluntary and involuntary; and do not hinder the grace of Your Holy Spirit from these gifts presented on account of my sins."[146] What is its meaning? Is it not contrary to that which we believe, namely, that the unworthiness of the celebrant does not affect the celebration of the mystery?**

The above sentence from the prayer of the holy anaphora of Basileios the Great certainly presents a serious difficulty in interpreta-

146. "Μνήσθητι, Κύριε, κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν σου καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ἀναξιότητος· συγχώρησόν μοι πᾶν πλημμέλημα ἑκούσιόν τε καὶ ἀκούσιον καὶ μὴ διὰ τὰς ἐμὰς ἁμαρτίας κωλύσῃς τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἁγίου σου Πνεύματος ἀπὸ τῶν προκειμένων δώρων." Translation adapted from The Faculty of Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Among the Saints Basil the Great* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1988), 35.

tion. And this is because its meaning at first glance is that the sins of the priest ("on account of my sins")[147] can obstruct ("hinder")[148] the grace of the Holy Spirit from the gifts, namely, their consecration into the Body and Blood of Christ. This first impression is mistaken, not because we want to impose in advance our own manufactured dogmatical preconceptions on the interpretation of the text, but because something else must be its meaning, as it will immediately become clear.

First, this entreaty is found in the text of the prayer after the consecration of the precious gifts. Already after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, these have "been blessed,"[149] "been sanctified,"[150] and "been shown forth"[151] ("bless, sanctify, and show forth them")[152] [to be] the Body and Blood of Christ. This is absolutely clear in the text of the Divine Liturgy. Second, nowhere in the same text does it say that the priest can be sinless or must not have sinned in order to celebrate the Divine Liturgy. On the contrary, immediately before the consecration we find a sincere acknowledgement and confession of the sins and of the unworthiness of the celebrants: "and we also, sinners and your unworthy servants, who have been deemed worthy to serve at your holy altar, not on account of our righteousness, for we have not done anything good upon the earth...."[153] The priest is not appointed to serve because he has no sins or because he is worthy ("No one is worthy..."),[154] but because he is "vested with the grace of the priesthood"[155] "on account of the mercy and compassion"[156] of God. Even in other prayers, and especially in the "Prayer of the

147. "διὰ τὰς ἐμὰς ἁμαρτίας."
148. "κωλύσῃς."
149. "εὐλογηθῇ."
150. "ἁγιασθῇ."
151. "ἀναδειχθῇ."
152. "εὐλογῆσαι αὐτὰ καὶ ἁγιάσαι καὶ ἀναδεῖξαι."
153. "καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ καὶ ἀνάξιοι δοῦλοι σου, οἱ καταξιωθέντες λειτουργεῖν τῷ ἁγίῳ σου θυσιαστηρίῳ, οὐ διὰ τὰς δικαιοσύνας ἡμῶν, οὐ γὰρ ἐποιήσαμέν τι ἀγαθὸν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς..."
154. "Οὐδεὶς ἄξιος..."
155. "περιβεβλημένος τὴν τῆς ἱερατείας χάριν."
156. "διὰ τὰ ἔλέη καὶ τοὺς οἰκτιρμούς."

proskomidē"[157] from the Liturgy of Basileios the Great, it is clearly stipulated that the priest acts not by himself, but by the command of Christ, who appointed him, through the mystery of priesthood and through the power of the Holy Spirit, "to this ministry."[158] Priests are sinners the same as all people, and for this reason do they offer the sacrifice for their own "sins and the ignorance of the people"[159] and commune "for the remission of sins."[160] For these reasons, it would never be possible for the consecration of the precious gifts to depend upon the moral quality of the priests. Sins are a personal matter for the priest, which concern his individual relationship with God. The Liturgy is a work of the Church and is carried out in the Holy Spirit through the grace of the priesthood.

Excluding this interpretation for the above reasons, we need to pursue the meaning of the sentence in another direction. Blessed[161] Nikolaos Kabasilas, in his *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, provides a very astute and theological explanation. In the sentence in question, the priest prays for himself in order that he also becomes worthy of sanctification, which the grace of God offers through the communion of the precious gifts. He discerns two ways in which the sanctifying grace of the Holy Spirit acts on the precious gifts. In the first way, the Holy Spirit sanctifies the gifts. No human sin can impede this sanctification precisely because this is not a work of human virtue. In the second way, the Holy Spirit sanctifies those who partake of the gifts through communion. In this second instance, the cooperation of our own zeal is required because the activity of the grace of the Holy Spirit is impeded by our indolence and human wickedness. It is precisely this activity of divine grace that the priest prays is not impeded by himself on account of his sins. In other words, so that the communion of the holy Mysteries is not harmful for him or "for judgment or condemnation."[162]

---

157. "εὐχὴ τῆς προσκομιδῆς."
158. "εἰς τὴν διακονίαν ταύτην."
159. "ἁμαρτημάτων καὶ τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἀγνοημάτων."
160. "εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν."
161. "μακάριος."
162. "εἰς κρῖμα ἢ κατάκριμα."

We quote the wonderful text of Nikolaos Kabasilas below in its entirety: "And the priest, after praying for those things necessary for everyone, also prays for himself to be sanctified by the gifts. What is this sanctification? It is to receive the remission of sins. For this is principally the effect of these gifts...."[163] He says, 'Remember Lord my unworthiness...of the gifts set forth.'"[164] The Holy Spirit gives remission of sins to those who commune these gifts. He says, 'Let not this grace be impeded for me on account of my sins.' For it is known that grace acts[165] on the precious gifts; one way according to which they are sanctified, and another according to which the grace sanctifies us through them.[166] Therefore, regarding the first manner, it is not possible for human evil to impede the grace of the Holy Spirit acting upon the gifts, but, just as their sanctification is not a work of human virtue, so neither is it possible for this to be impeded by the wickedness of human beings.[167] The second manner also requires our zeal. On this account, it is also impeded by our indolence. For the grace sanctifies us through the gifts if it might find us suitable for sanctification, but if it might fall upon us unprepared, it would not bear us any advantage and would inflict grave harm on us. It is this grace—whether it is only the remission of sins or also another gift given with that to those who take part in this sacred supper with a pure conscience—which the priest prays may not be impeded from the gifts, as being able to be impeded through the wickedness of human beings"[168] (*Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, chapter 34.1–6).[169]

---

163. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 34.1–2 (SC 4bis:212–213).

164. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 34.3 (SC 4bis:214–215).

165. Phountoulēs's quoted text is missing the word, "ἐνεργεῖν."

166. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 34.4 (SC 4bis:214–215).

167. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 34.5 (SC 4bis:214–215).

168. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 34.6 (SC 4bis:212–215).

169. As already noted, the paragraph numbers of Kabasilas's work will be given consistent with the Sources Chrétiennes edition, which differs from those

In the Divine Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos the Brother of the God, there is a corresponding sentence, which actually has a broader meaning: "And do not reject your people, O Lover of humankind, on account of me [the priest] and on account of my sins."[170] That is to say, it refers to the activity of the Holy Spirit through the precious gifts on the people of God. In this case, the sins of the priest can become a reason for grace to be impeded or for God to reject His people, since either the prayers of the priest for the people will not be accepted by God or subjectively the people will be scandalized by the openly sinful life of the priest. Perhaps, also in the Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great, the parallel phrase can be interpreted that this has to do not only individually with the priest, as Kabasilas explains it, but also with the faithful, as in the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos. Namely, Christians sin when scandalized by the sins of the priest and the priest becomes the reason for the activity of grace by the Holy Spirit being impeded also for them.

## 412

**In my parish, according to tradition, the Small Hagiasmos is not celebrated on March 1st and on April 1st if they coincide with weekdays during Great Lent but is transferred to the first Saturday after these days. Is this correct?**

I am not aware if there exists any relevant prohibitive rubric. Nor does the customary taxis prevent the celebration of the Small Hagiasmos during the weekdays of Great Lent. There is only an issue regarding September 1st and January 1st, about which we have written in the answer to question 359 in detail.

Moreover, the service of the Small Hagiasmos is not a festive but a solemn service, a type of a supplication, which is why its celebration is also not opposed to the mournful character of these days. If the practice that you follow in your parish is old, perhaps it can be

---

cited by Phountoulēs.

170. "Καὶ μὴ δι' ἐμὲ (τὸν ἱερέα) καὶ διὰ τὰς ἐμὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀθετήσῃς τὸν λαόν σου, φιλάνθρωπε," B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 90.

explained by the fact that the Small Hagiasmos was formerly connected with the Divine Liturgy and, inasmuch as the Liturgy was not celebrated on these days, the Hagiasmos service also was not celebrated. However, nowadays, this reason is not valid. For several centuries now, the Hagiasmos has been developed into a self-contained service independent from the Divine Liturgy. As far as I know, everywhere, even on the Holy Mountain, the Small Hagiasmos is mandatorily celebrated on both these first days of the month, even if they fall on a weekday of Great Lent.

## 413

**The Typikon provides that the typika and the Beatitudes are chanted during Sunday Liturgies. In practice, however, the antiphons are chanted. Is this not an irregularity that must be corrected?**

## 414

**When the antiphons are chanted on Sundays, which verses must be said, the verses of the weekday antiphons or the verses from the typika, or are the verses not necessary, but rather the ephymnia suffice, as is usually done?**

The subject of the chanting of the antiphons or typika in the Divine Liturgy is not so simple and "typical" as it appears at first glance. Precisely the diversity—or rather the anarchy—observed in this matter indicates that there exists a deeper problem, which, since it has not been confronted with the necessary knowledge of the tradition as well as the needs and special circumstances of the present-day age, leads to all of the well-known absurdities of practice. Since the antiphons–typika constitute a part of the Divine Liturgy that is the most sacred, but also from a pastoral perspective, the most significant worship synaxis of the Church, we are obliged to address the issue with proportionate seriousness and attention. Our retrospection back into the tradition, namely, into the history of the antiphons–typika, will necessarily be quite exhaustive because an opportunity has not been previously given for us to discuss these topics and the

knowledge of our tradition is necessary for the comprehension and the selection of more correct solutions.

According to the Typikon of the Great Church, which is in use nowadays, "On every Sunday, the typika and the Beatitudes are mandatorily chanted in the Liturgy with the eight resurrectional troparia of the Oktōēchos, but when forefeast or afterfeast days for the feasts of the Lord or of the Mother of God fall on Sundays, or even commemorations of saints who are celebrated, four from the sixth ode of the canon of the relevant feast or the relevant saint are chanted in addition to the four of the Beatitudes" (G. Violakēs, *Typikon of the Great Church of Christ*, M. Saliveros, in Athens 1921, p. 31).[171] The same thing was also stated with fewer words in the *Church Typikon According to the Taxis of the Great Church of Christ*,

171. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 31. As described, the Beatitudes are chanted in the following manner:

Ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου μνήσθητί ἡμῶν, Κύριε, ὅταν ἔλθῃς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου,
Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν,
Μακάριοι οἱ πενθοῦντες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ παρακληθήσονται,
Μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς, ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν,
Μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην, ὅτι αὐτοὶ χορτασθήσονται,

Μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται,
Troparion (1)
Μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν Θεὸν ὄψονται,
Troparion (2)
Μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί, ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ Θεοῦ κληθήσονται,
Troparion (3)
Μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν,
Troparion (4)
Μακάριοί ἐστε, ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ διώξωσι, καὶ εἴπωσι πᾶν πονηρὸν ῥῆμα καθ' ὑμῶν, ψευδόμενοι ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ,
Troparion (5)
Χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.
Troparion (6)
Δόξα Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ καὶ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι
Troparion (7)
Καὶ νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, Ἀμήν.
Troparion (8)

of Kōnstantinos, Prōtopsaltēs, second edition, seventh reprinting, in Constantinople 1874, p. 4: "For the Liturgy [of Sundays], typika and the Beatitudes."[172]

This is also in force nowadays in monasteries, because the Typikon of the Monastery of Saint Sabas provides for this, which is the Typikon in use in the sacred monasteries.[173] In fact, the service of the typika derives its origins from Jerusalem, from the above-mentioned Monastery of Saint Sabas. This is evidenced by its structure and the manner of chanting, which is clearly monastic. Originally, it consisted of an independent service, as it is in our present-day Hōrologia, which also are themselves monastic, "according to the taxis of the holy Lavra of Saint Sabas,"[174] as older editions recorded in the title of this book. The service of the typika appears for the first time in the *Codex Sinai 863* of the ninth century, which is *The Hōrologion according to the Rule of the Lavra of Our Holy Father Sabbas.*[175] It bears the title, "For communion,"[176] and is actually a communal or individual monastic service of communion without a priest, a type of monastic Presanctified. Its similarity with the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos is obvious even today. As an independent service, it had been introduced from Jerusalem to the Stoudite Monastery of Constantinople, together with other elements of the Jerusalemite Typikon, and was chanted daily during the distribution of the antidōron, either after the Divine Liturgy or after the Ninth Hour during fasting

172. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, *Πρωτοψάλτης, Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 4.

173. Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012), 463. On the Typikon of Saint Sabas, see the discussion in the notes to question 401.

174. "κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς εὐαγοῦς Λαύρας τοῦ ἁγίου Σάβα."

175. "Ὡρολόγιον κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τῆς Λαύρας τοῦ ἁγίου πατρὸς Σάββα."

176. "Εἰς τὴν μετάληψιν." The word "εἰς" here is translated as "for" to denote purpose, but an alternative translation could be "at" in the sense of a specific time.

days (see *Rule of Observance of the Most Holy Monastery of Stoudios,*[177] *Codex Vatopediou 322*).

From the Typikon of the Monastery of Evergetis of Constantinople of the twelfth century (*Codex Athens 788*), we have an important piece of information about the transition from the initial practice above to that of the present-day.[178] Namely, when Liturgy did not take place, the typika were chanted independently after the Ninth Hour. However, when a Liturgy was celebrated, the typika were chanted within the Liturgy. They[179] divided the service[180] into two, and its first part (Psalm 102, Psalm 145, and the Beatitudes) replaced the section of the Liturgy before the entrance, while the final psalms (33 and perhaps 144) covered the distribution of the antidōron. The intermediate elements were very correctly omitted because they coincided with the corresponding elements of the Divine Liturgy (troparia, the creed, "Holy, holy...,"[181] "Our Father...,"[182] koinōnikon). From an eleventh century Georgian translation of the Liturgy, we deduce that even in Jerusalem, already during this period, the typika were chanted together with the Liturgy.

The Typikon of Evergetis provided for a daily celebration of the Divine Liturgy and communion. Thus, the typika and the Liturgy were now permanently connected in this monastery, while, according to the testimony of the same Typikon, the remaining monasteries, those which had kept the Typikon of the "renowned" Stoudite Monastery, "do not chant the typika in the Liturgies."[183]

---

177. "Ὑποτύπωσις τῆς καταστάσεως τῆς εὐαγεστάτης μονῆς τῶν Στουδίου." See the translation in Thomas and Hero, 1:84–119.

178. In general, see the translation and edition in Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis,* Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.5–6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2000–2005).

179. "They" refers to the ones celebrating the Liturgy during this period.

180. The "service" here refers to the service of the typika.

181. "Ἅγιος, ἅγιος..."

182. "Πάτερ ἡμῶν..."

183. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle,* Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 690–691. The Typikon of Evergetis here describes the chanting of the typika during the

Eventually, the connection between the typika and the Liturgy became generalized to all the monasteries after also the Stoudite Monastery itself adopted it, as the *Rule* again attests. In the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of Patriarch Philotheos (fourteenth century), which represents the practice of the Monastery of the Great Lavra of the Holy Mountain, in which Philotheos was abbot when he wrote it, the chanting of the typika and the Beatitudes during the Divine Liturgy is provided for according to the monastic taxis (*Codex Panteleēmonos 6277-770*).[184]

This is what occurred in the monasteries. However, what was the practice of the parish temples?

In the parishes, as also originally in the monasteries, the Divine Liturgy began from the entrance of the priests and the people into the temple, without anything being chanted during this entrance. Immediately afterwards the readings were read. This ancient taxis is

---

Liturgy and also the contrast with certain other monasteries with an explanation of the reasons for this difference.

184. Philotheos Kokkinos (Φιλόθεος Κόκκινος) was a patriarch of Constantinople (r. 1353–1354/1355, 1364–1376) and while abbot of the Great Lavra on Mount Athos authored the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* (Διάταξις τῆς Θείας Λειτουργίας) and the *Diataxis of Hierodeaconship* (Διάταξις περὶ τῆς ἱεροδιακονίας). Through the work's popularity and influence as a ceremonial, the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* canonized the Athonite rubrics for the Divine Eucharist that came to govern the present celebration of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy. This discussion is based on Robert Taft, "Mount Athos: A Late Chapter in the History of the Byzantine Rite," *DOP* 42 (1988): 191–194. Phountoulēs used the *Diataxis* as one of the sources for a modern publication of a Hierodiakonikon, *Ἱεροδιακονικόν, περιέχον ἅπασαν τὴν διάταξιν τῆς Ἱεροδιακονίας εἰς τὸν ἑσπερινὸν καὶ τὸν ὄρθρον εἰς τὰς τρεῖς λειτουργίας* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἔκδ. Πανσέληνος, 1989). The text of the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* (*Codex Panteleēmonos 6277-770*) is published in Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας*, Texte und Forschungen zur Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Philologie no. 15 (Ἀθῆναι: Ἡ ἐπιστημονικὴ ἐπιτροπὴ πρὸς ἀναθεώρησιν καὶ ἔκδοσιν τῶν λειτουργικῶν βιβλίων, 1935), 1–16. In addition, also while abbot, Philotheos authored the *Diataxis of Hierodeaconship* (*Διάταξις περὶ τῆς ἱεροδιακονίας*), which provides direction on how the deacon serves with a priest in Vespers, Matins, and Liturgy. The text of the *Diataxis* may be found in PG 154:745–766. When referring to the "*Diataxis of Philotheos*," unless otherwise noted, Phountoulēs is referring to the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy*. For the reference in the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* to the chanting of the Beatitudes, see Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 6.

attested to by the old sources, the sacred writers, such as Saint Justin and the sacred Chrysostomos, and the ancient Liturgies, such as the *Apostolic Constitutions* (end of the fourth century). The same taxis was in force up until the seventh century, as we can gather from the *Mystagogy* of Saint Maximos the Confessor, where the enarxis of the Divine Liturgy is still marked by the entrance and the readings.[185] The development of this part of the Liturgy must begin from this period. First, it appears that they[186] introduced an entrance psalm that accompanied the processional entrance of the clergy and the people into the temple. They chose the ninety-fourth as such a psalm ("O come, let us rejoice in the Lord…"),[187] a psalm which up until its sixth verse constitutes a wonderful invitation for the glorification of God by the worshipping community: "O come, let us rejoice…let us make a joyful noise…let us anticipate his face in acknowledgement and let us make a joyful noise to him with melodies…O come, let us worship and bow down to him…."[188] From all indications, we must conclude that it had "Alleluia" as its ephymnion and that its stichologia was interrupted at the principal entrance verse, "O come, let us worship…."[189] Later this verse underwent a successful Christological revision; the "to him"[190] became "to Christ."[191]

185. Saint Maximos the Confessor (ca. 580–662), a major Church Father whose writings were highly influential in Byzantine theology. His work, *Περὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῆς μυσταγωγίας* (*Concerning Ecclesiastical Mystagogy*), is a commentary on the Liturgy. For its text, Phountoulēs most likely used PG 91:657–718. The critical edition is found in Christian Boudignon, ed., *Maximi Confessoris Mystagogia una cum Latina interpretatione Anastasii Bibliothecarii*, CCSG 69 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011); and an English translation in Jonathan J. Armstrong, trans., *On the Ecclesiastical Mystagogy - A Theological Vision of the Liturgy* (Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2019). Armstrong bases his translation on the critical edition, which is reproduced in his work, and provides an overview of the work as well as a bibliography.

186. The ones who introduced the entrance psalm during this period.

187. "Δεῦτε ἀγαλλιασώμεθα τῷ Κυρίῳ…"

188. "Δεῦτε ἀγαλλιασώμεθα… ἀλαλάξωμεν… προφθάσωμεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐξομολογήσει καὶ ἐν ψαλμοῖς ἀλαλάξωμεν αὐτῷ… Δεῦτε προσκυνήσωμεν καὶ προσπέσωμεν αὐτῷ…" This translation is modified from NETS, 595.

189. "Δεῦτε προσκυνήσωμεν…"

190. "αὐτῷ"

191. "Χριστῷ."

At the beginning of the eighth century, two other psalms were also added before the entrance psalm (ninety-fourth), probably consecutively, so that at last, for the sacredness of the number, the psalms became three: the ninety-first ("It is good to acknowledge the Lord…"),[192] the ninety-second ("The Lord reigned, he was robed in majesty…"),[193] and the ancient ninety-fourth. Saint Germanos of Constantinople (d. 733) first attests regarding the existence of three antiphons at the beginning of the Liturgy in the *Ecclesiastical History and Mystical Contemplation*.[194] The two new psalms, both also doxological, are selected certainly for their strongly festive tone, so appropriate for the joyful, celebratory character of the synaxis. In the meantime, it is characteristic that Psalm 93 is omitted ("The Lord is God of vengeance"),[195] precisely because it has a stern and penitential content. Moreover, the other two psalms, 91 and 92, are interpreted by the Fathers as also referring prophetically to the Resurrection of the Lord, something which is compatible with the Paschal character of the Divine Liturgy and especially with the resurrectional theme of Sunday, the preeminent day for the celebration of the Divine Eucharist (see Eusebios of Caesarea, *Commentary on Psalms 91 and 92*.[196] Athanasios the Great, *Exegesis on Psalms 91 and*

192. "Ἀγαθὸν τὸ ἐξομολογεῖσθαι τῷ Κυρίῳ…"

193. "Ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν εὐπρέπειαν ἐνεδύσατο…"

194. Saint Germanos I, patriarch of Constantinople (r. 715–730), is attributed authorship of a commentary on the Liturgy entitled, *Ἱστορία Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ καὶ Μυστικὴ Θεωρία* (*Ecclesiastical History and Mystical Contemplation*), a work of synthesis, major influence, and importance. For a discussion of authorship and an important study, see René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966), 125–180. For its modern translation and an introduction, see Paul Meyendorff, trans., *St. Germanus of Constantinople, On the Divine Liturgy* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984). For a detailed examination of the work's significance, see Robert Taft, "The Liturgy of the Great Church: An Initial Synthesis of Structure and Interpretation on the Eve of Iconoclasm," *DOP* 34–35 (1980–1981): 45–75.

195. "Θεὸς ἐκδικήσεων Κύριος."

196. For Eusebios of Caesarea's commentary on Psalms 51–95.3, see PG 23:441c–1221c.

*92*,[197] and others).[198] Initially, they chanted these antiphons in the well-known "asmatic" manner; namely, they recited all the verses of the psalms and the people chanted the ephymnion at each verse, which was different for every psalm. And they were framed again in the well-known manner, with diaconal synaptes, a priestly prayer, and an exclamation, precisely as it is also done up until nowadays.

From the history of divine worship, we know for what practical liturgical reason these changes occurred at the beginning of the Liturgy at the start of the eighth century. At the time, the entrance of the clergy and the people during the (small) entrance began to fall into disuse, and the proskomidē had been transferred from the cheroubikon to the beginning of the Liturgy. The covering of the proskomidē required relatively long chanting. Later, the proskomidē was transferred prior to the antiphons. The abridgment of the psalms then also began, and their limitation to four verses for each one, which were the salient and most suitable ones, namely, the first two and the last two ("small antiphons").[199]

From the beginning of the eighth century onward, the only way of celebrating the Divine Liturgy in the parish temples was the one that we have described above. At the start of the Liturgy, the three antiphons with Psalms 91, 92, and 94 and their ephymnia were chanted, which were not everywhere and always the same. This matched the tradition of the parishes; the manners and possibilities of chanting in them. The ancient Typikon of the Great Church of Constantinople of the ninth to the tenth century (*Timiou Staurou 40* and *Patmos 266*), the Typikon of the Great Church of Thessaloniki of the fifteenth century (*Athens 2047*), which Saint Symeōn the archbishop of Thessaloniki had written, all the parish liturgical manuscripts, and the Byzantine commentators of the Divine Liturgy (Germanos, Theodōros of Andida, Pseudo-Sōphronios, Michaēl Psellos, Nikolaos Kabasilas, and Symeōn of Thessaloniki)

197. For Saint Athanasios's commentary on the psalms, see PG 27:60–545.

198. On patristic commentaries on Psalms in general and individual Fathers before the sixth century, see Marie-Josèphe Rondeau, *Les Commentaires Patristiques du Psautier (IIIe – Ve siècles)*, OCA 219 and 220 (Rome: Pont. Insitutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1962 and 1985).

199. "μικρὰ ἀντίφωνα."

knew only this taxis, which was in use, as we have seen, for Sundays and the other days of the year when the Divine Liturgy was celebrated. In this context, Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki makes an absolutely correct historical–liturgical observation: "Therefore, one must know that the service of the Liturgy alone has remained being done according to the ancient taxis; for which reason the priest so blesses God and immediately so says the litany of peace, and the three antiphons are sung as a type of the Trinity, which are from the ancient 'asmatic' service" (*Dialogue*, chapter 347).[200] For the feasts, other antiphons were developed with specially chosen psalms for every single occasion. They are the antiphons of the feasts that we even chant nowadays.

The fact that the parish taxis of the antiphons is older than the monastic with the typika and the Beatitudes, which we have seen above, is evident not only from the witnesses that were preserved, but also from the ancient form of the antiphons, and even from the manner of the typika's and the Beatitudes' introduction into the already existing liturgical framework. Namely, while diaconal synaptes and priestly prayers do not exist in the independent service of the typika, it has them when chanted in the Liturgy. In addition, the verse of the parish third antiphon, "O come, let us worship..."[201] (Psalm 94:6a), also remains as an eisodikon.

From the monasteries, the chanting of the typika during the Divine Liturgy spread also to the parishes, certainly with tendencies of imposition on the parish Typikon. The monastic liturgical books, with the elements of monastic Vespers and Matins (Hōrologion, Paraklētikē, Mēnaia, Triōdion, Pentēkostarion), already had been introduced into liturgical use in the parish temples and these provided for the chanting of the typika and the Beatitudes with special troparia or with the third and sixth ode of the canon of the celebrated saints of the day. In theory, the monastic Typikon became prevalent also indeed on Sundays, as we observed at the beginning. Thus, the typika with the Beatitudes took the place of the parish

200. PG 155:525a. Compare the translation in Simmons, *St. Symeon*, 72.
201. "Δεῦτε προσκυνήσωμεν..."

resurrectional Sunday antiphons, which henceforth were set aside for weekdays.

However, practice was more enduring than theory. The typika, despite the rubrics of the modern Typika, remained on the margins for special usage only.[202] The antiphons, burdened by all the consequences of corruption in the meantime, continued to be chanted also on Sundays. The characterization of the old antiphons as "daily" was perhaps an additional cause for their mistreatment. They no longer had verses/psalms, after they no longer were part of the Sunday service. The chanting of the ephymnia without verses made their multiple repetitions illogical. The isolation of the people from chanting and its monopolization by the chanters again had as a result the neglect of the ephymnia by the latter, since the chanters did not discover anything especially enticing from a musical perspective in the ephymnia's simple traditional chanting. Thus, the antiphons were led into veritable atrophy, in the triple, if not only a double, repetition of the ephymnion, without verses, without the "Glory both now,"[203] which concluded the antiphons, without the participation of the people in their chanting. For their restoration, the recent initiative of the *Calendar-Typikon of the Church of Greece* aimed to introduce verses from the typika into the antiphons. However, let it be permitted for us to say that this solution was not adequate. Below, we shall see the reason why.

The typika with the Beatitudes could not become prevalent in parish practice, despite the support of the modern official Typikon. This was to be expected. Let us leave aside the participation of the people in the chanting, which one way or another was limited during the period when the attempt of introducing them occurred. However, their introduction aggravated it.[204] The great majority of the people could not know all the psalms by heart, certainly the first of which is quite lengthy. We are not speaking about the troparia of the Beatitudes, but much more regarding the third and sixth ode of the

202. When capitalized, "Typikon" (pl., Typika) refers to the liturgical book. The lowercased "typika" refers to the service of the typika.

203. "Δόξα καὶ νῦν."

204. Namely, the limitations on the people's participation in the Liturgy.

canons of the saints, which require texts, knowledge, and skill to be chanted. However, the basic reason was the length that the chanting of the typika and the Beatitudes added to the Divine Liturgy, where it had already become prevalent for it[205] to be attached to another lengthy service, Matins.

The Slavic churches, which are more conservative in their liturgical practice, preserved the typika and the Beatitudes in the Sunday Liturgies (note that in them the Liturgy is not attached to the Matins), but in practice they did different abridgments of the verses from the psalms and returned to the old ephymnion of the Beatitudes, "Remember me, O Lord,"[206] or "Remember me, O Lord, in your kingdom,"[207] namely, they left out the troparia. We have witnesses that abridgments of such types—traditional after all, as we also saw for the antiphons—occurred or occur also in the remaining Orthodox churches. Even in many monasteries, there also prevailed for analogous reasons an intermediary form, which combined antiphons and typika. The first and second antiphons are chanted and afterwards as a third antiphon the Beatitudes with the troparia that are provided for by the Typikon, about the omission of which the monks always have a particular sensitivity.

Thus, with the Sunday antiphons and with their well-known variety on feasts, and with the typika and the Beatitudes and with the different attempts of their abridgment, many traditional forms developed that could contribute with their richness to halting the decline of this part of the Divine Liturgy and to its embellishment. Every single form has its particular advantages. Their interchangeability could offer many elements to the more decent celebration of the Divine Liturgy and to its enrichment, with elements especially flexible and rich in doxological and didactic content. As long as there is an awareness that a need exists for an effort to suspend the present unacceptable situation, which attests to neglect and an unacceptable abandonment to the slope of decay.

---

205. The Divine Liturgy.
206. "Μνήσθητί μου, Κύριε."
207. "Εν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου μνήσθητί μου, Κύριε."

And first of all, the antiphons. It has been demonstrated by what we said above that the antiphons characterized as "daily" are the ancient Sunday antiphons according to the parish Typikon. They could legitimately be restored, with the wonderful four verses of their psalms and with their simple ephymnia, which will facilitate the participation of the people in their chanting.

The second and the third antiphons also have an additional possibility of variety in their ephymnia. Aside from "Save us, O Son of God...,"[208] the second antiphon also has an ephymnion, "Through intercessions of your saints, save us, O Lord...."[209] Aside from the apolytikion, which in any case is also chanted after the entrance, the third also has as an ephymnion, "Save us, O Son of God...," just as the eisodikon that belongs to this antiphon. These are an older form of antiphons that exist in our Hōrologia and are also chanted nowadays on the Holy Mountain. They could certainly also be chanted in the parishes, alternately also with the modern ones, to give a desirable variety.

Likewise, the entire psalms and the Beatitudes with their glorious troparia could be chanted again in the typika, whether from the Oktōēchos according to the Sunday tone, or from the third and sixth odes of the canons of the saints being celebrated, during feasts or in combinations that the Typikon provides for. As long as the Liturgy begins fifteen minutes earlier in order that a delay not be caused. Or it is possible for four verses chosen from each psalm to be chanted more attentively (the first two and the last two according to the model of the antiphons) and the Beatitudes without troparia, only the verses or with their ancient ephymnion ("Remember me [or us], O Lord,"[210] or "Remember me [or us], O Lord, in your kingdom,"[211] "Remember me [or us], O Lord, when you come in your kingdom"[212]) according to the practice of the Slavic churches.

Our liturgical tradition gives us these many possibilities.

---

208. "Σῶσον ἡμᾶς, Υἱὲ Θεοῦ..."
209. "Πρεσβείαις τῶν ἁγίων σου σῶσον ἡμᾶς, Κύριε..."
210. "Μνήσθητί μου [ἡ ἡμῶν], Κύριε."
211. "Ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου μνήσθητί μου [ἡ ἡμῶν], Κύριε."
212. "Μνήσθητί μου [ἡ ἡμῶν], Κύριε, ὅταν ἔλθῃς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου."

The combination of the parish practice with the monastic, namely, the mixing of the ephymnia of the antiphons with the verses from the psalms of the typika, is not acceptable, necessary, or consistent with tradition. It gives the inaccurate impression that this preserves the letter of the Typikon, which prescribes the chanting of the typika on Sundays. However, in reality, this confuses and corrupts two completely independent and venerable traditions of different origins.

## 415

**Why was the feast of the Third Finding of the Head of the Honorable Forerunner transferred to May 26, 1980, a Monday of the Holy Spirit? Was it not possible for the feast to be transferred to another more appropriate day?**

The question is theoretically interesting, but practically idle, because the next such instance will take place in the year of our Lord 2037!

This is something quite rare because Pascha must be early in order for this to occur, namely, on April 5 or 6. In the span of a century, from 1951 up until 2050, we have Pascha only four times on these days of the month: April 5 in 1953, 2037, and 2048, and April 6 in 1980. Pentecost then is celebrated respectively on May 24 or 25, and the synaxis of the Holy Spirit again respectively on May 25 or 26. As is well known, the Third Finding of the Precious Head of the Forerunner is celebrated on May 25. According to the instructions of the Typikon, if Pentecost falls on the Third Finding (May 25), the latter is transferred to the next day (May 26) and its service is chanted together with the service of the feast, namely, of the Holy Spirit. And if again the synaxis of the Holy Spirit falls on the Third Finding, both services are chanted together. The same thing was provided for by the Typikon to occur also on the feast of Saints Kōnstantinos and Helenē (May 21) if it coincided with the synaxis of Holy Spirit—but with the Old Calendar—because Pascha would not be so early with the Gregorian Calendar. Consequently, during 1980, the Typikon in use was applied (G. Violakēs,

*Typikon of the Great Church of Christ*, M. Saliveros, in Athens 1921, pp. 276–277).[213]

Together with the questioner, I also share the opinion that it is not correct for this to be done, even if the Typikon provides for it. The feast of the Third Finding of the Head of the Honorable Forerunner certainly has a revered subject, namely, the discovery of the head of the Baptist in Comana and its relocation to Constantinople during the ninth century. Its other two discoveries are celebrated on February 24 (for these, see the book of Manouēl Gedeōn, *Byzantine Heortologion*, 1899 in Constantinople, pp. 77 and 108).[214] It is a later feast that is not commemorated in many ancient Synaxaria and Mēnaia, or is assigned to a second place in the Mēnologion, after the commemoration of Saint Therapōn, bishop of Cyprus or that of Blessed Iōannēs Psychaïtēs. In the Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople from the tenth century, there exists only the commemoration of the spiritual contest of the holy hieromartyr Therapōn.[215] But while Typika or Mēnaia have the commemoration of the Finding, they do not have a special service and refer to February 24. All these things do not mean that the Honorable Forerunner, the one "greatest among those born from women" according to the testimony of our Lord himself (Matthew 11:11), is being disparaged. After the most holy Theotokos, he is a center of the entire Church's devotion, and splendid feasts are conducted in his honor: his commemoration, synaxis, conception, and birth. Even every Tuesday is dedicated to him. However, this commemoration of the Third Finding of His Precious Head admittedly is not his significant feast.

By contrast, another day of celebration was not dedicated on the Heortologion for the Holy Spirit. It is true that this celebration was also not old, nor initially had the importance that we attribute it nowadays. Furthermore, it does not exist in the Typikon of Saint Sophia, which we mentioned, but a synaxis in honor of the Holy

213. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 276–277.

214. Μανουὴλ Γεδεών, *Βυζαντινὸν Ἑορτολόγιον: Μνήμαι τῶν ἀπό τοῦ Δ' μέχρι τοῦ ΙΕ' αἰώνος ἑορταζομένων ἁγίων ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει* (Κωνσταντινούπολις: Ἑλλην. Φιλολ. Συλλόγου, 1899), 77, 108.

215. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:298–299.

Apostles is recorded.[216] The great feast is Pentecost and they placed this synaxis of the Holy Spirit on its following day, the second day of the feast, just as they placed the synaxis of the Theotokos on the day following the Nativity of Christ, and that of the Forerunner after Theophany and that of the righteous Symeōn after the Meeting of Christ, and so forth.[217] The service of this day is also incomplete. For example, it does not have a polyeleos, anabathmoi, and a gospel in Matins.

Nevertheless, and quite rightly, in the consciousness of the Church's whole body, the feast of the Holy Spirit is found at the level of the great feasts of the Lord. The Holy Trinity is honored in this way and temples built in its honor celebrate. It is also a public holiday. We also have liturgical efforts for the elevation and completion of those elements that are lacking. Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki wrote a lengthy prayer to the Holy Spirit and added it to the older prayers of kneeling. The Typikon of the Monastery of Hagiou Pavlou of the Holy Mountain supplements the service by adding anabathmoi, a prokeimenon ("Your Good Spirit will guide me..."),[218] a gospel for Matins (the pericope of Renewal Thursday: John 3:1–15), "Father, Word, Spirit, Trinity in unity..."[219] at the "Glory..." and "Both now...," and "O Heavenly King..."[220] at the verse, "Have mercy, O God...."[221]

Chanting the service of the Holy Spirit, together with the service of finding the relics of a saint, even a great one, is not something liturgically correct. For this reason and very correctly, the Typikon of the Monastery of Xēropotamou of the Holy Mountain transfers the Finding to Tuesday in the instances where the Finding would coincide with Pentecost and with the Monday of the Holy Spirit. This is an initiative that is absolutely justified liturgically and theologically.

---

216. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:140–141.
217. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:158–159, 188–189, and 226–227.
218. "Τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἀγαθὸν ὁδηγήσει με..."
219. "Πάτερ, Λόγε, Πνεῦμα, Τριὰς ἡ ἐν μονάδι..."
220. "Βασιλεῦ οὐράνιε..."
221. "Ἐλέησόν με, ὁ Θεός..."

The history of the Church's Heortologion has many such examples and precedents. The most characteristic, but forgotten because it is very ancient, is of the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross. The great feast was the Dedication of the Temple of the Resurrection (September 13). The Exaltation was the second feast—a type of synaxis in honor of the Precious Cross. The feast of the Cross was elevated to a great feast of the Lord to such an extent—it became a second Great Friday—that it overshadowed the Dedication. In this case, the same thing is not going to occur. Pentecost will remain the "ultimate, great, and perfect feast."[222] But also, the feast of the Holy Spirit, the feast of the Holy Trinity, ought to be highlighted and emphasized. It ought to be placed also liturgically at the level that theologically and essentially it is found nowadays in the Church's consciousness. As such, it is not compatible with the Finding of the Head of the Honorable Forerunner, just as also the feast of the Exaltation was not with the commemoration of Saint Iōannēs Chrysostomos.

The Typika of the Holy Mountain of Hagiou Pavlou and Xēropotamou are excellent guides for what must take place.

## 416

**It is often said by many that the Divine Liturgy lasts too long, and Christians become fatigued. If this is a serious reason, how would it be possible and at what points could some shortening take place for its length to be reduced?**

The question is difficult and serious. No one can easily ignore this in the name of the Church's faith and tradition by considering the things said as "pretexts for sins"[223] or fruits of weak faith and lack of zeal for the divine. Nor does the Church's tradition and its centuries-old practice justify, as we think simplistically many times, a "hard" tact of such a type, and conversely, the Church does not encourage a frivolous and arbitrary treatment of such serious subjects ostensibly in the name of contemporaneousness and adaptation or,

222. "ἑσχάτη, μεγάλη, καὶ παντέλειος ἑορτή."
223. "προφάσεις ἐν ἁμαρτίαις," Ps 140:4 (translation from NETS).

after a more ecclesiastical fashion, of the application also here of the principle of "oikonomia." Nor for this reason, also, was the Divine Liturgy ever monolithic and inflexible, as it is said sometimes in an unhistorical manner, but nor was it also liquid and malleable, as some wish to believe instead. If we consider that the Divine Liturgy is the Church's most important and sacred worship practice and, as such, not only in its substance but also in its form, is the work of the Holy Spirit in the last analysis, then we can uniquely understand both the coexistence and balance within it—and more generally in all the Church's worship practice and activity—of two apparently, but also essentially, opposing forces, namely, on the one hand, of firm tradition, and of the age-old form, and, on the other hand, of adaptability, progress, and development.

We respect the great faith and the zeal of those, where even only the formulation of such a question and the fear of an accommodating answer to it would move them to sacred anger against those who impiously contemplate reforms and transgressions of the decisions of the holy Fathers and of the Church's sacred liturgical tradition. Especially in our land,[224] the fear of such a reaction does not let us face and speak seriously and frankly regarding burning issues. We pretend that they do not exist, while we encounter them in everyday practice and often solve them superficially. For example, nowadays—to bring up a very characteristic example outside of the Divine Liturgy—who would have the courage to say or to write with boldness that the kathismata of the Psalter are not recited in the parishes? The Typikon continues to prescribe them, and the Psalter's allocation tables are published precisely in the Psalters and in other liturgical books. If you might discuss with someone the utility of reading the Psalter, he would uphold and assure you that the Psalter is, according to the Fathers, "the voice of the Church."[225] However, when you do not hear it during Vespers or in Matins, he would inform you that it is read before the service. If you persist in asking what were the daily kathismata, I do not know how many could give you the correct response.

224. Greece.

225. "ἡ φωνὴ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας."

Regarding the Divine Liturgy, perhaps we do not have so many glaring examples. But the ones that we will cite are sufficient to show that even in the Liturgy we have something analogous. Namely, a corresponding discord between print, which represents the taxis theoretically in force, and practice, which adapts and develops—for better or worse is another issue—depending on the needs and the requirements of our age.

In a preceding answer, we discussed the typika and the antiphons. In how many temples are the typika and the Beatitudes not chanted, even though the Typikon in use considers them as mandatorily chanted during the Sunday Liturgy? —wrongly, as we saw. In how many temples are the verses of the antiphons not said? In how many are omitted—or said inaudibly—the ektenēs, the petitions for the catechumens, and the petitions and prayers of the faithful? In how many are chanted other things without rhyme or reason instead of the prescribed koinōnika? And getting to a slightly more ancient, but more strict practice: What happened to the allēlouarion and "Let [our mouths] be filled,"[226] or Psalm 33 during the distribution of the antidōron? It is clear that shortening of a significant extent is done in practice precisely because the demand for limiting the time length of the Divine Liturgy seems to find support.

Do we contend that this tendency for abridgment of the Divine Liturgy and limitation of time length has much deeper roots in the Church's ancient practice itself? Let us bring up two examples, one from an ancient text and one from liturgical practice.

A treatise is attributed to Proklos of Constantinople (d. 446), which is entitled, "Sermon concerning the tradition of the Divine

226. "Πληρωθήτω." Phountoulēs is referring to the hymn, "Πληρωθήτω τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν αἰνέσεως, Κύριε, ὅπως ἀνυμνήσωμεν τὴν δόξαν σου· ὅτι ἠξίωσας ἡμᾶς τῶν ἁγίων σου μετασχεῖν Μυστηρίων· τήρησον ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ σῷ ἁγιασμῷ, ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν μελετῶντας τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου. Ἀλληλούϊα. Ἀλληλούϊα. Ἀλληλούϊα," which may be translated, "Let our mouths be filled with Your praise, O Lord, that we may sing of Your glory, because You have made us worthy to partake of Your holy Mysteries. Keep us in Your sanctification, that all day long we may meditate upon Your righteousness. Alleluia. Alleluia. Alleluia." Translation taken from, *The Divine Liturgy of our Father among the saints John Chrysostom* (New York, NY: Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, 2018), 49. In other editions, the word "μελετᾶν" appears in place of "μελετῶντας."

Liturgy."[227] It is not particularly important that nowadays this text has come to be accepted as later. At the outset, he speaks concerning the ancient liturgical tradition, which was crystallized in the two ancient Liturgies of Saint Iakōvos the Brother of God (τοῦ ἀδελφοθέου) and of Clement, namely, the one contained in the *Apostolic Constitutions*. Next, he speaks concerning the origins of both Byzantine Liturgies, of Basileios the Great and of the sacred Chrysostomos. We quote the relevant passage: "Afterwards, Basileios the Great, while observing the indolence and degeneracy of those human beings who also shrink in fear because of this Liturgy's length—while he himself thought that it was not long or redundant—handed down an abridged one to be said when stopping the laxity of those praying together and hearing[228] on account of the unnecessary waste of much time... But the ones who later threw off the steadfastness and warmth of the faith while concerning themselves in the works and cares of the world, when shrinking in fear from the length...of the Liturgy, scarcely attended to the holy hearing of the Lord's words; for which reason also the divine Basileios who made use of therapeutic means, made this [Liturgy] known in an abridged manner. Not

227. "Λόγος περὶ παραδόσεως τῆς θείας λειτουργίας," (PG 65:849b–852b). For a discussion of the text and authorship, see F. J. Leroy, "Proclus, 'De Traditione Divinae Missae': un faux de C. Paleocappa," *OCP* 28 (1962): 288–299.

228. The words, "συνευχομένων" and "ἀκροωμένων" are above translated literally. However, together these two terms may refer to those preparing for baptism. According to Phountoulēs, the second term was used specifically to designate "non-Christians sympathizing with Christianity" (questions 379–381):

> The catechumens and those preparing for illumination, who, naturally, were not yet baptized, not only came into the temple, but also attended the common prayers and teaching, both during the evening and morning synaxes, and the celebration itself of the Divine Liturgy up until the petitions for them after the ektenēs, when they were also dismissed. After the readings and the sermon, and prior to the catechumens, according to the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the "hearers" (ἀκροώμενοι) were dismissed, who were non-Christians sympathizing with Christianity, namely, not even catechumens.

In Patristic use, "hearers" can also mean a class of penitents (Lampe, s.v. "ἀκροάομαι").

long afterwards, again, our Father, Iōannēs the Golden Tongue,[229] being zealously distressed as a shepherd for the salvation of the flock, when observing the indolence of human nature, wished to uproot every satanic pretext; for which reason he also abridged many things and ordered [the Liturgy] to be celebrated in a concise manner, lest human beings—who by slow degrees most favor freedom and leisure when deceived by the thoughts of the adversary—would be absent from such an apostolic and divine institution, just as many were also observed often doing this in many places up until the present time."[230]

These historical details are not exact. The three Liturgies, of Iakōvos, Basileios the Great, and Chrysostomos, are independent of each other—despite their parallels and similarities—and the Liturgy of Basileios the Great was not derived from an abridgment of the Liturgy of Iakōvos, nor is the Liturgy of the sacred Chrysostomos an abridgment of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great. However, that the "indolence"[231] of human nature and the need for a concession to it was the reason that the concise Liturgy of Chrysostomos nearly completely prevailed, this is without doubt.

Again, a characteristic example from liturgical practice is the transfer of the proskomidē (prothesis). From the cheroubikon, which is its original and natural place, it was transferred to the antiphons, and from the antiphons to the Matins in the parishes and to the Trithektē in the monasteries,[232] before the enarxis of the Divine Liturgy. And this occurred in order for time to be gained and for delay to be avoided where it was inevitable if the proskomidē were to take place at the cheroubikon or at the antiphons.

From what we have written, it appears clear that the demand for shortening the Divine Liturgy, by a concession to our especially

229. "ὁ τὴν γλῶτταν χρυσοῦς Ἰωάννης."
230. PG 65:849b–852b.
231. "ῥαθυμία."
232. Also known as the "τριτοέκτη," for studies of the Trithektē, see: M. Arranz, "Les prières presbytérales de la Tritoekti de l'ancien Euchologe byzantin," *OCP* 43 (1977): 70–93, 335–354; Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Ἀκολουθίαι τοῦ Νυχθημέρου*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 1' (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 11–44.

indolent and impatient age nowadays, could not in principle be ruled out as unacceptable and inconsistent "from the outset" with the meaning of tradition and with the mystery's sacredness. That the faithful must not be exhausted and be indignant—rightly or wrongly—because of an overly extended service, I think that it is not up for discussion that this must not occur. This also prevents the possibility of actual participation of the faithful, among whom are also elderly, sick, and children, and does not assist in maintaining their spiritual clarity and attention, which the sacred moments of divine worship require.

In order to remove any possible misunderstanding, let us also take note of the obvious. These observations do not pertain to the monasteries. Conditions are completely different there, and for this reason divine worship not only is able, but it is also imperative for it to have a greater duration of time. However, the parish community is something else. It does not have in its make-up "the warmth and steadfastness of faith"[233] either of the Christians of the early church or of the monks. Its members are concerned "with the works and cares of life."[234] And the Church understands this and employs appropriate "therapeutic"[235] means, namely, the shortening of services, to speak with the words of the text that is attributed to Proklos.

Let not the following thoughts below be considered contradictory. The Divine Liturgy does not have a need to be shortened to become shorter. Indeed, I would say the opposite. Its decent celebration requires the return to more exact and full forms, where poor development in parish temples, especially of our fatherland,[236] has brought about decay that damages its sound traditional and liturgical structure.

And in particular: It is necessary for the antiphons to return to their full form and for their irresponsible and antitraditional mistreatment to cease (we spoke regarding this topic in response to questions 413 and 414). Similarly, it is necessary for the allēlouarion

233. "τὸ θερμὸν καὶ στερρὸν τῆς πίστεως."
234. "ταῖς τοῦ βίου πράξεσι καὶ φροντίσι."
235. "θεραπευτικάς."
236. Greece.

with its verses to be restored in its proper form, and during it, for the censing, the reading of the prayer before the gospel, and the transfer of the diaconal reading of the gospel to the ambōn (we wrote concerning this in the answer to question 286) to take place with taxis and decorum. It is essential for the sermon to take place—the duration of which should not exceed fifteen minutes—immediately after the gospel reading, namely, at its correct place liturgically, historically, and traditionally, and for us to strive quickly to reach the ideal in order that there be no celebration of a Liturgy without teaching being inextricably connected with it, namely, the homily, the sermon (and we spoke concerning this topic in the answer to question 125). The ektenēs and petitions of the faithful—perhaps even of the catechumens—nowadays are wrongly omitted or trouble the correct taxis when they are inopportunely said at various points of the Divine Liturgy inaudibly (see also the answers to questions 70 and 71 concerning this). Theologically and liturgically unacceptable is also the transfer of the faithful's holy communion after the dismissal of the Divine Liturgy or its distribution while at the same time that the diaconal petitions and the exclamation of thanksgiving and the prayer behind the ambōn are being said (see the answer to question 185). The same necessity exists for the restoration of the chanting of "Let [our mouths] be filled," in parishes, between "Always, now and ever..."[237] and "Arise, having partaken...,"[238] in order that the transfer of the Holy Elements to the prothesis takes place in an orderly manner.

Certainly, all these things would increase instead of shortening the time length of the Divine Liturgy. However, at some point, we must think seriously and responsibly not only regarding the abridgments, but also about the restoration of the decay to the body of our liturgical practice, which damages it very seriously and exposes us to the eyes of all pious people, who received from us the liturgical tradition and maintained it "like an apple of the eye," in contrast with what is done so irresponsibly by us.

237. "Πάντοτε νῦν καὶ ἀεί..."
238. "Ὀρθοί, μεταλαβόντες..."

However, instead, time could be gained from other points of the Divine Liturgy, again in a traditional manner. For example, not to chant many apolytikia after the entrance. Not to delay the return of the Gospel book by the deacon after its reading on the ambōn, which tends to develop into a second small entrance. Not to prolong the censing during the cheroubikon. Not to make commemorations during the great entrance, which is particular, as we saw, only to the hierarchical Liturgy (answers to questions 10, 70, 231, 290–292). To omit the second more modern plērōtika before the "Our Father" (answer to question 281). Not to extend the duration of communion since priests are accustomed to say during that time personal pious prayers before and after holy communion from the special services of holy communion and of thanksgiving.

However, that which increases the time length of the Divine Liturgy and probably makes it fatiguing is not so much what is said and chanted during it, but how is it is said and chanted. Those who have had the fortune to serve or to attend a Liturgy on the Holy Mountain have a direct experience that splendid Liturgies—with typika and Beatitudes, with four readings (double pericopes of the epistle and gospel), ektenēs, and double plērōtika, and without omitting anything from what is provided for by the taxis—scarcely last an hour (naturally without the sermon, which is replaced by the readings during Matins and at trapeza). However, the tempo of the chanting and the enunciation is such that not only does it not fatigue, but the dialogue of priest and people is kept constantly lively and vibrant. In parishes during more modern times, the chanting in the Divine Liturgy took a different course, which certainly is not traditional. The emphasis was placed on the chanting and on the elaborate musical enunciation of the diaconal petitions and of the priest's exclamations.

According to the old taxis, which is observed at the Ecumenical Patriarchate and on the Holy Mountain, only the antiphons, the apolytikia, the trisagion, the cheroubikon, the megalynarion of the Mother of God, "We have seen the true light...,"[239] and "Blessed

239. "Εἴδομεν τὸ φῶς..."

be the name of the Lord..."[240] are chanted. And these rapidly and simply, only with the exception of the "Dynamis" of the trisagion, the cheroubikon, and the koinōnikon, as well as also "I shall love you Lord..."[241] in the major concelebrations. This is because they are "covering hymns," namely, they have the purpose of covering certain priestly acts that take place at that time, such as the transition to the kathedra,[242] the preparation of the priest, the proskomidē, and holy communion, as well as the kiss of the concelebrants, respectively. The priestly exclamations, the diaconal petitions, the readings, and all the other responses of the people are said melodically, but in an unadorned style of enunciation. The closer to this style we find ourselves, the more traditional and the more liturgically and logically correct is the performance of these chants of the Divine Liturgy. And the main reason for the delay is found precisely in the languid oriental[243] chanting of the priest's exclamations and the diaconal exhortations, in the conversion of the melodic reading of the readings and of the people's responses to chanting, and not in the ostensible or actual length of the Divine Liturgy.

Without us underestimating the services of the night and day, Vespers and Matins, as splendid opportunities for prayer and worship of God, and without us ceasing to encourage the faithful to come to them, we must accept that for the overwhelming majority of Christians the only weekly time of worship is the Divine Liturgy of Sunday. Moderation in this case is also necessary. Neither do we rush and constrict the time of worship in the name of the rapidity and nervousness that characterizes our age, nor again do we overstep the logical and bearable limits of the faithful's stamina. The usual

240. "Εἴη τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου..."
241. "Ἀγαπήσω σε, Κύριε..."
242. Namely, the "throne."
243. The word, "ἀνατολίτικη," translated here as "oriental," refers to the distortion of chanting, colloquially known as "ἀμανέδες," which takes its name from the musical repetition and elongation of the word, "ἀμάν" in rembetika and other secular music of Asia Minor. In general, modern schools of Byzantine chant consider them inappropriate. The "ἀνατολισμοί" (orientalisms) may be a historical result of the role untrained singers often took in performing both secular and ecclesiastical music and not discerning between their distinct forms.

argument that human beings are not fatigued to remain for hours in arenas and theatres, is extremely weak in reference to divine worship. The circumstances in it are completely different and the conditions of participation in it come under another heading. Our liturgical tradition shows that the time length of services in parishes did not exceed an hour-and-a-half. A concisely celebrated Liturgy together with a ten- or fifteen-minute sermon lasts about an hour-and-a-half. Less is insufficient, and more is excessive and wanting in discretion.

However, there exists also another more direct and more effective way of limiting the length of the Divine Liturgy. I am talking about the unacceptable and anti-Orthodox approach of omitting or shortening the very prayers of the Liturgy. I would not even have mentioned it because neither theoretically nor practically could meddling of such a type in the sacred texts be justified. It is an "outlawed" solution. The pertinent rubrics and the Fathers direct the attention of the priest to this point and emphasize that he sins gravely and mortally when he omits or shortens or even reads without feeling the sacred prayers of the Divine Liturgy. The "Instruction for a priest"[244] that is attributed to Basileios the Great states epigrammatically: "Stand in compunction and purity of heart in the holy sanctuary, not looking around here and there, but standing with fear and shuddering before the Heavenly King. Neither rush through nor shorten the prayers because of human weakness, nor have a high regard for a human person, but look only towards the King who is present and the Hosts that stand around him." Only for the history of the matter, let us mention such an unfortunate attempt, which occurred in the publication of the three Liturgies by Athēnagoras Kavvadas, the then bishop of Boston and afterwards of Thyateira (*Sacred Service Book*..., Boston, 1944).[245] In this edition, the prayer of the second antiphon ("O Lord our God, save your people...),[246]

244. "Παράγγελμα εἰς ἱερέα."

245. Ἀθηναγόρας Καββάδας, ed., *Ἱερὰ Φυλλάς: περιέχουσα τὰς ἱερᾶς λειτουργίας τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου, Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου καὶ τὴν τῶν Προηγιασμένων δώρων ἔτι δὲ τὰς ἀκολουθίας τοῦ Ἑσπερινοῦ, Ὄρθρου, Ἀρτοκλασίας, Θείας Μεταλήψεως καὶ Εὐχαριστίας, κτλ.* (Pomfert Center, CT: Τύποις Ἑλληνικῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς, 1944).

246. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, σῶσον τὸν λαόν σου..."

the ektenēs and its prayer, the petitions for the catechumens and their prayer, the diaconal petitions and both prayers of the faithful and the prayer before "Our Father" ("We entrust to you..."[247] and "Our God, the God who saves..."[248]), are omitted from the Liturgy of Chysostomos/Basileios, but the prayer of the proskomidē ("O Lord God, Pantokratōr, the only holy..."[249] and "O Lord our God, who created us..."[250]) is provided to be said only when the priest concelebrates with the deacon. Moreover, a score of edits is done to the text of the great prayers of the Liturgies and of the central prayer itself of the "holy anaphora." Fortunately, this audacious initiative did not continue.[251] The poor example of this publication has not found imitators.

## 417

**In the troparion, "Σῶσον Κύριε τὸν λαόν σου..." (O Lord, save your people...), we also find the reading "νίκας τοῖς εὐσεβέσι κατ' ἐναντίων..." (grant victory to the pious over the adversaries) instead of "νίκας τοῖς βασιλεῦσι κατὰ βαρβάρων..." (grant victory to the kings over the barbarians). Which phrase is more correct? How was "νίκας τοῖς εὐσεβέσι κατ' ἐναντίων..." (grant victory to the pious over the adversaries) introduced and why do we have two readings and why are misunderstandings created?**[252]

During their synaxes, consistent with the instruction of the Apostle Paul, Christians made and make "entreaties, prayers, appeals, and thanksgivings for all human beings, for kings, and for all who are in authority" (1 Tim 2:1–2). In our liturgical texts, there are a score of

247. "Σοί παρακατατιθέμεθα..."
248. "Ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ σῴζειν..."
249. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, παντοκράτωρ, ὁ μόνος ἅγιος..."
250. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ κτίσας ἡμᾶς..."
251. Although in 1943, under the auspices of the same Bishop Athēnagoras Kavvadas, an Euchologion was published, *Εὐχολόγιον ἢ Ἁγιασμάταριον: περιέχον τὰ ἱερὰ μυστήρια καὶ τὰς κυριωτέρας ἱερὰς ἀκολουθίας τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας* (Pomfert Center, CT: Τύποις Ἑλληνικῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς, 1943).
252. For related discussions, see questions 189 (end of the answer), 212 (end of the answer), 225, 256, 396 (where there is a brief discussion of imperial polychronismoi), and 588.

such entreaties in the diaconal petitions, in prayers, and in hymns. During the age when these texts were written, the "βασιλεύς,"[253] namely the Byzantine emperor, was the highest authority, chiefly in whose realm the Orthodox Church and its worship developed. But also, apart from the earlier Byzantine state and after the creation of national states during modern times, again the higher authority was called a "βασιλεύς" (king). Consequently, the Byzantine term until recently did not create any problem. However, during the age of the Tourkokratia[254] and after the abolishment of the institution of the king in modern states, it was to be expected that the subject of the correction or adaptation of the pertinent petition would be raised. Particularly in our land,[255] this topic has a certain acuteness and seriousness because of the idiosyncrasies of our people, their political passions, and the interests that they have concerning worship, even regarding the point that its language be comprehensible.

However, also theoretically, if we examine the question, again we would find ourselves in a difficult position in order for us to justify our possible insistence on ancient terminology. Prayer and divine worship are a living voice of the faithful and the Church, and address real contemporary circumstances. They frame existing entreaties, which they also consign through prayer in love to God's providential care. This is shown in practice by the constant renewal that liturgical texts undergo with the addition of new entreaties, prayers regarding events, and contemporary outputs of ecclesiastical hymnography. Adaptation also takes place in terminology; for example, books are no longer called parchments, nor warships dromons or triremes, nor automobiles wagons. Namely, in this case, it is difficult for us to persuade the faithful that one should say "βασιλεύς" (king) and mean the President of the Democracy.[256] Moreover, the texts of prayers are not like biblical texts or like the Symbol of Faith,

253. The word, "βασιλεύς," can be translated as "emperor" or "king."

254. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

255. Greece.

256. Namely, in Greece.

which do not admit modification, because of their standard and immutable transmission.

In the ancient and in the contemporary practice of the Church, it appears beyond doubt this is the theoretical position that we commonly accept. Thus, petitions are omitted during divine worship or even removed from the printed liturgical books, which always existed in them, such as the relevant entreaties on behalf of emperors, kings in the litany of peace, in the ektenés, in the Lité, and in the prayer behind the ambōn, the polychronismoi, and similar things. But also, revisions of relevant phrases attest that this took place indeed in an age where human beings were less educated and more conservative. For example, during the period of the Tourkokratia, there began the replacement of the petition, "Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ θεοφυλάκτων βασιλέων ἡμῶν..." (For our most pious and God-protected emperors...) with the petition, "Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν" (For pious and Orthodox Christians...) in the litany of peace, in the ektenés, and in "Εἰξάμεθα" (Let us pray) of the Midnight Office and Compline; the omission of the petition on behalf of the emperors at the beginning of Matins (before the Six Psalms) or its replacement with the petition for the hierarchs or "τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν" (the pious and Orthodox Christians); and the modification of the royal acclamation during the hierarchical Liturgy, "Κύριε, σῶσον τοὺς βασιλεῖς" (O Lord, save your emperors), to, "Κύριε, σῶσον τοὺς εὐσεβεῖς" (O Lord, save the pious) (see answers to questions 225 and 256). Indeed, in several manuscripts from the era of the Tourkokratia, the royal psalms of Matins (Psalms 19 and 20) are even replaced with the mournful Psalm 101 and the three royal troparia ("O Lord save your people...,"[257] "May He who voluntarily was raised on the Cross...,"[258] and "Everyone Protection"[259]) with the three penitential, "Have mercy on us, O

---

257. "Ἔσωσον Κύριε τὸν λαόν σου..."
258. "Ὁ ἑκουσίως ἐν τῷ Σταυρῷ ἀνυψωθείς..."
259. "Ἱκεσία πάσιν..."

Lord...,"[260] "O Lord, have mercy on us...,"[261] and "Open unto us the gate of compassion...."[262]

Certainly, there exist many cases of entreaties for kings in prayers and hymns that are said as is. This is done not because it is forbidden for these texts to admit any modification, but because it is not immediately necessary or because it is not easily workable. Namely, other prayers are said inaudibly, and other troparia are chanted in services or at Hours, which are nearly not noticed or even not at all noticed by the people. In practice, it is difficult, because these entreaties are embedded in extensive and complex phrases (such as in the prayer of the anaphora of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great) or present serious metrical difficulties (such as for example the kontakion of the Meeting of Christ, the kontakion of the Cross—although I have sometimes heard the incongruous correction "τοὺς πιστοὺς κυβερνήτας ἡμῶν," "our faithful rulers," done in it—and so forth). For these instances, what we wrote above could be considered to have application, namely, that by the term, "βασιλεύς" (king), the corresponding political authority in the modern state is meant, as it is called nowadays in modern terminology.

Particularly the troparion "Σῶσον Κύριε τὸν λαόν σου..." (O Lord, save your people...) is almost the only one of the troparia at issue that has an especially great liturgical use. It is chanted at all the feasts of the Precious Cross, at their afterfeasts, on Wednesdays and Fridays, in the service of daily Matins, in Hagiasmoi, and especially in occasional services before authorities and often before important persons, at great gatherings of people, where they know it by heart and continue to note its relevant phrase. We cannot say that the modification of this phrase "νίκας τοῖς βασιλεῦσι κατὰ βαρβάρων..." (grant victory to the kings over the barbarians) to "νίκας τοῖς εὐσεβέσι κατ' ἐναντίων..." (grant victory to the pious over the adversaries) is metrically and conceptually inappropriate. The number of syllables remains the same, the accents are found in place, and the meaning remains inviolable, while it becomes indeed more spiritual, since

260. "Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, Κύριε..."
261. "Κύριε, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς..."
262. "Τῆς εὐσπλαγχνίας τὴν πύλην..."

"ἐναντίων" (adversaries) can be understood as visible ones of all kinds, but also invisible spiritual enemies of the faithful. This correction must be quite old and has gained a footing in many publications (for example, in the edition of the Mēnaia of Paraskevopoulos, in Athens 1904)[263] and is well known to all and accepted by all. As an expression of personal opinion, let me make the observation that it is not necessary for this troparion to be placed among "the historically established" and therefore as a necessity in this case that the word "kings" must "indicatively" "mean in general the rulers," as the *Calendar-Typikon* of the Apostolikē Diakonia[264] notes. I think it is preferable for it to be chanted corrected. Moreover, it is chanted corrected in official occasional services and Hagiasmoi that are broadcast by radio and television.

## 418

**Why after the prayers of the washing, when the priest says, "You have been justified, you have been illuminated,"[265] does he sprinkle the newly illumined with water? Some think that we baptize with sprinkling, like the Roman Catholics. Why does this take place and what meaning does this sprinkling have?**

This sprinkling does not have any relation to "emergency baptism" or "clinical baptism," which took place and takes place through sprinkling or pouring and which later was generalized for all those being baptized by the Roman Catholic Church. The newly illumined is already canonically baptized with the threefold immersion at the moment when the words are exclaimed, "The servant of God is baptized...in the name of the Father...." Consequently, this is not baptism with sprinkling and its similarity to the Westerners' baptism is without foundation.

---

263. *Μηναῖον: περιέχον ἅπασαν τὴν ἀνήκουσαν αὐτῷ ἀκολουθίαν μετὰ τῆς προσθήκης τοῦ τυπικοῦ κατ' ἀρχαίαν μέν, νεωστὶ δὲ τυπωθεῖσαν διάταξιν τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μ. Ἐκκλησίας διορθωθὲν ὑπὸ Βαρθολομαίου Κουτλουμουσιανοῦ μετὰ πολλῶν προσθηκῶν κεκανονισμένων ἀδείᾳ καὶ ἐγκρίσει τῆς Ἱερᾶς Συνόδου τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, 12 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: Π. Π. Παρασκευόπουλος, 1904).

264. *Ἡμερολόγιον-Τυπικὸν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος).

265. "Ἐδικαιώθης, ἐφωτίσθης."

The sprinkling, regarding which the question is concerned, is a remnant of the service of "washing"[266] or "cleansing"[267] or the "cleansing"[268] of holy baptism, which took place as a rule on the eighth day from the baptism day, as even nowadays it is still recorded in our Euchologia. At that time, they brought the newly illumined—who through this entire interval did not change his/her clothing and did not wash—to the temple, to the baptistery, or to the skeuophylakion, according to the rubrics of the manuscripts, and washed his/her entire body and cleansed his/her baptismal garments. This was done in honor of the material elements of holy baptism and chrismation, which throughout these seven days remained upon the body of the one who had been baptized. The relevant sources and the rubrics of the manuscripts emphasize the sacredness of these material elements and draw the attention of the newly illumined, or his/her parents and sponsors, if he/she is a baby, to not desecrate them and forbid any washing of his/her body or face. On the eighth day, during the service of the washing, after the reading of the relevant prayers, the priest loosened the baptismal garments and the same one began the washing, while saying the phrase, "You were baptized, you were illuminated...,"[269] which is encountered in the manuscripts in diverse versions. There does not exist agreement in the codices regarding the manner in which the priest began the washing, because it differed, as it seems, according to place and time. According to some manuscripts, he simply sprinkled the faces of the newly illumined with water (*Codex Sinai 961*), according to others he washed the face alone or even "the right hand and the left hand" (*National Library of Athens 713, Sinai 973)* or "he washed their forehead, breast, hands, and feet" (*Athens S 2086).* According to yet others, he took "a new sponge" or "new cotton" or "the end of a linen cloth" or "part of the headdress," namely the koukoulion, soaked it with water, and with it "wiped" in the shape of a cross "the head, the ears, the eyes, and his other limbs, where he had been anointed with holy myron" or

266. "ἀπολούσεως."
267. "ἀπολουτροῦ."
268. "ἀπολούτρου."
269. "Ἐβαπτίσθης, ἐφωτίσθης..."

"the head with the forehead, the nose, the breast, the belly, and the kidneys" or "the senses on which he anointed the myron" or also "all the places" (*Codices Athens 662, 664, 667, 670, 1910, S 64, S 573*). In other manuscripts, it is attested that the newly illumined was completely unclothed and the priest took water with his hands and "poured on his head three times" (*Athens S 724*). And in others, he washed him/her completely: "Next, the priest loosens his stauria[270] and undresses him completely and seats him in the baptismal font. And the priest taking water with his hands seals him on the head three times while thus saying: 'You were baptized....' And he, and in like manner the sponsors, washes his entire body" (*Megistēs Lavras 21*). According to yet other manuscripts, the washing took place with water that the priest blessed beforehand "in a vessel," blowing and sealing it or even reading a special prayer of Hagiasmos (*Athens 665, Sinai 966, 991*). Finally, according to *Athens Codices 848* and *851*, the washing of the newly illumined took place with wine: "putting wine in a vessel, he washes the newly illumined with his garments."

The present-day rubric of the Euchologia is composed from a strange—but not unusual in our liturgical taxis—combination of two traditions, which the editor of the rubric attempted to reconcile. First, it speaks concerning the soaking "with clean water" of the fringes of the "sash"[271] and of the "sheet"[272] and the sprinkling of the child, by the priest, while he says the words, "You were justified, you were illuminated."[273] It next prescribes the wiping with a sponge of the face, the head, and the remaining limbs of the body (obviously the ones that were anointed with holy myron), while he says the phrase in another variant ("You were baptized, you were enlightened, you were anointed, you were sanctified, you were washed

270. Phountoulēs defines "τὰ σταυρία" as "a strip of cloth or a cord that was put around the neck and was brought crosswise to the chest and then tied in the back or at the waist of the baptized" (see question 348–350). Other terms for the stauria include "ζώνη," "σταυρόν," and "σταυρίον."

271. "ζωνάρι."

272. "σάβανον."

273. "Ἐδικαιώθης, ἐφωτίσθης."

clean in the name of the Father…").[274] In practice, at least as far as I know, priests follow their local traditions, which do not always agree with this rubric.

Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki gives us a commentary and a more complete description of the washing in his *Dialogue*: "He ought to be clothed and, because of the holy anointing, not wash himself completely for seven days [the newly illumined, the baptismal garments], but with these garments to clean the hands[275] as one who is sanctified. After the week, which signifies the completion of this septenary life, he goes to the temple and to the priest, and is washed by him; the priest through sacred prayers washing him off with a sponge and water on those places of the head and hands that he was anointed with holy myron, aside from the other parts of the body. For these things, this one who was baptized is washed in a special place, lest if anything of those holy elements, namely, of the waters of baptism or of the myron, falling might be walked on. Wherefore also, let the one who is an adult receive instruction from the priest for him to observe concerning this…but if he is a baby, let the mother give assurances concerning this. And let her have an instruction that after the seventh day she brings the baby to be washed off[276] by the priest, to be completely washed[277] by her and that which was washed off to be poured into a special and pure place. But also, the garments in which she wrapped the baby for the seven days ought to be washed off privately" (*Dialogue*, chapter 68).[278]

From Symeōn's description and from the rubrics of the manuscripts, it seems that throughout the entire Byzantine period, but even during the years of the Tourkokratia,[279] the washing took place regularly both for adults and for infants. However, the practice slowly began to deteriorate. The priest would read the prayers of

274. "Ἐβαπτίσθης, ἐφωτίσθης, ἐμυρώθης, ἡγιάσθης, ἀπελούσθης εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρός…"

275. "ἀποσμήχειν τὰς χεῖρας."

276. "ἀπολούσασθαι."

277. "ἀποπλυθῆναι."

278. PG 155:233d–236b.

279. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

washing immediately after the baptism and performed its formal beginning with the sponging of the body's limbs or even with only the sprinkling of the baby. Mothers would take care of the rest, since it was not possible for the children to remain unwashed for eight complete days. Already Symeōn implies that in his era during the interval of these days they changed the baptismal garments of the babies and "washed"[280] everything together during the eight days "privately."[281] Namely, the washing gradually went through stages of development, which led it to being made symbolic, as also took place in other similar cases, for example, with the loosening of the marriage crowns on the eighth day.

The present-day sprinkling of the newly illumined or the wiping of his/her forehead is the remnant of the older practice of washing.

## 419

**Metropolitan Methodios of Kerkyra of blessed memory (*Teleturgics*, vol. 1, Kerkyra 1958, pp. 224–226) maintains that "the celebrant wrongly casts oil into the hands of the sponsor"[282] and from there anoints the one being baptized. What is the correct practice?**

The custom for the priest to pour the exorcized oil into the right palm of the sponsor and there, to dip in his finger, and to anoint the catechumen, is not attested to by the manuscripts, nor even nowadays is it generally widespread. The rubrics of the codices and sources insist, as we saw in the answer to question 353, on the need for anointing the entire body and stress its particular theological significance. The bishop or priest began the anointing when rubbing oil crosswise on certain major parts of the body. Manuscripts do not

280. "ἀπέπλυναν."

281. "ἰδιαζόντως."

282. "κακῶς ρίπτει ὁ τελετουργὸς ἔλαιον στὰ χέρια τοῦ ἀναδόχου." Although conveying the point of the author, this is not a precise quote. The text reads, "Οὐδὲ πρέπει νὰ ρίπτηται ἔλαιον εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ καὶ οὕτῳ νὰ ὑποθάλπωνται αἱ προλήψεις," Μεθόδιος Κοντοστάνος, *Τελετουργικὴ τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἁγίας Ἐκκλησίας*, 2 vols. (Κέρκυρα: Τυπογραφεῖον Γ. Ξ. Βλάχου, 1958), 1:225. Methodios Kontostanos (1881–1972) was Metropolitan of Kerkyra (1942–1967).

specify where he dipped the one or two of his fingers (according to certain manuscripts) in order to do this anointing. Did he dip them in the oil that was floating in the water of the baptismal font? This does not seem very likely, especially if one takes into consideration the relatively low height of the baptismal font in baptisteries, which would hinder the priest's movements. Even more difficult would be the use of this oil for the entire body's anointing. It is more likely that the priest dipped his finger into the "cup"[283] within which was the oil he had blessed, and from which obviously the anointing of the body was done straightaway.

Some manuscripts prescribe that the anointing of the whole body be done by the sponsor (*Athens 668, 848, 851, S 64, S 724*). The contemporary practice, which the questioner refers to, obviously was derived from this. The priest poured the oil into the sponsor's hands in order that the sponsor would do the total anointing of the body of the one being baptized. Perhaps since the container of oil was not always provided, for the priest to dip his finger, the oil used for this purpose was in the sponsor's palm. It was more practical. This hypothesis also explains the reason for which this practice was not generally widespread. According to many manuscripts, the anointing of the whole body was not done by the sponsor, but by the deacons, the deaconesses for women, by minor clergy "servants,"[284] or even alone by the priest. Indeed, *Athens S 696* strictly prohibits the sponsor from doing the anointing: "And the priest alone anoints the whole body of the child. Another does not extend his hand to touch anything or to anoint the child with oil...nor may the sponsor... dare, but the priest himself anoints him with oil." This is also why the priest did not pour oil into the palm of the sponsor and consequently did not take oil from the palm to do the anointing of the main limbs. Methodios of Kerkyra of blessed memory follows this second tradition, which he thinks most correct and seeks to also impose generally in order to suppress superstitions. I hold the opinion that this is excessive. Every region follows its traditions, which are deeply rooted in its worship practice.

283. "τὸ τρυβλίον."
284. "ὑπηρέτας."

## 420

**In the Cyclades, where early Christian customs are preserved intact, a triple procession is not done, but rather a simple circular procession around the baptismal font.**

Local liturgical customs are worthy of special attention because often they preserve ancient traditions and shed light upon the historical growth and the course of development for our liturgical forms. There exist instances where local tradition is more correct than that which for a variety of reasons generally became prevalent. The opposite is sometimes also the case. This is why our position regarding these traditions is not an easy task. It requires a study and knowledge of history, of the sources, and of the meaning of the liturgical forms. For this reason, the superficial knowledge[285] and conceit of many have often destroyed very respected and correct worship traditions and replaced them with others of a questionable nature in the name of wrongly intended liturgical uniformity. And to come to the specific question, the fact that three circles are done around the baptismal font during the chanting of "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ..."[286] has become prevalent everywhere does not necessarily mean that this alone is correct, or is at least the only correct one, and that a simple circular procession, which has been preserved in certain regions, must by necessity give way to the triple one.

"As many of you that have been baptized into Christ..." is nowadays the hymn that is chanted in the baptismal Liturgies of great feasts of the Lord instead of the trisagion. It has also precisely the same role in the service of holy baptism. It forms the connection between baptism and Liturgy, the welding joint between the two mysteries, which for many centuries were celebrated inseparably unified, as the three steps of Christian initiation, baptism—chrismation—Eucharist, are inseparably unified theologically and liturgically. Namely, after baptism and the clothing of the newly illumined with the white baptismal garments, chrism was administered, and after-

285. "ἡμιμάθεια." The literal meaning of this word is "partial knowledge" and appears to echo a popular Greek saying, "Ἡ ἡμιμάθεια εἶναι χειρότερη ἀπὸ τὴν ἀμάθεια" (Partial knowledge is worse than ignorance [no knowledge]).

286. "Ὅσοι εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε..."

wards in a procession from the baptistery, where the baptism and the anointing of myron took place, they went to the temple, where the baptismal Divine Liturgy was celebrated for the new members of the Church. A covering hymn of this procession was "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ...," which was chanted as many times as the passage from the baptistery to the main temple lasted. According to *Patmos 266*, "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ..." was chanted as an ephymnion to the verses of Psalm 92, "The Lord reigned, he was robed in majesty...,"[287] which is completely well-suited to the ephymnion and to baptism. The psalm speaks regarding the Lord King who has been clothed in majesty and might, concerning rivers and about voices of many waters, and regarding the sanctified house of the Lord, into which the newly illumined were entering. It appears from later practice and from the manuscripts that Psalm 31 ("Blessed are those whose transgressions were forgiven...,"[288] where its first verses are referring to the blessedness of those whose sins—through holy baptism—God pardoned) was also used as a psalm of stichologia for "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ..." instead of Psalm 92, or even as a processional psalm for the procession of the newly illumined, independent from "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ...," just as it is also chanted nowadays. At the time, a double chanting of "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ..." is attested to, during the anointing of the newly illumined with holy myron, as well as before and at the end of the procession after the entrance into the temple in place of the trisagion, according to the form of which this is also chanted nowadays (three times, Glory, Both now, the end—"Have put on Christ"—and Dynamis). The epistle reading and the gospel that follow are readings of the baptismal Divine Liturgy, and for this reason they do not exist in almost all the manuscripts. According to the ancient taxis, "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ..." served at the same time as the eisodikon and trisagion of the baptismal Liturgy. The censing during its chanting is explained either as an element of the procession or as

287. "Ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν ἐπρέπειαν ἐνεδύσατο..."
288. "Μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι..."

an element of the trisagion. They also cense nowadays on the Holy Mountain, as is well known, during the trisagion.

That the entrance took place from the baptistery to the temple during the chanting of "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ..." is attested to by many manuscripts: "And he chants 'As many of you that have been baptized into Christ...' and enters" (*Athens 670*), "And he enters with the sponsor and child into the middle of the temple while chanting 'As many of you that have been baptized into Christ...' three times" (*Athens 564*), "And he enters with the newly illumined before the doors of the holy bēma" (*Athens 667, M. Lavras Θ 88*), "And then in this manner the priest begins 'As many of you that been baptized into Christ...' and enters into the holy bēma with the newly illumined" (*Sinai 961*), "And the priest comes in with the newly illumined at the entrance and the entire Divine Liturgy then follows" (*Sinai 973*), "After this, while [the priest] makes an entrance, he chants 'As many of you that have been baptized into Christ...'" (*Athens 661*).

During the departure of the procession for the transition from the baptistery to the temple, it appears that a circle around the baptismal font took place, apparently one circle, as the manuscripts attest, "And [the priest] taking the censor, circles the baptistery with the sponsor who holds the hand of the newly illumined, while chanting 'As many of you that have been baptized into Christ...'" (*Athens 1910*), "The priest enters while censing all around the baptistery, and turning around the font.[289] The priest chants 'As many of you that have been baptized into Christ...' three times" (*Athens 696*). According to another manuscript, the circling took place after the arrival at the temple, around the ambōn, which was in the middle: "And after this prayer ['Blessed are you, O Lord...'[290]] the priest does an entrance around the ambōn with the baptized and the sponsor, while they chant 'As many of you that have been baptized into Christ...,' circling the ambōn also while chanting this three times" (*Athens 851*). If no ambōn existed, the circling took place in the middle of the temple: "And he enters with the newly illumined

289. "ἡ γάστρα."
290. "Εὐλογητὸς εἶ, Κύριε..."

before the doors of the holy bēma. And he circles him around" (*M. Lavras 88, Athens 667*), "The priest then makes an entrance circling with the sponsor and newly illumined while chanting with the people 'As many of you that have been baptized into Christ…'" (*Athens 665*).

When later, baptisteries no longer existed and the baptism of infants took place in the middle of the temple in a portable baptismal font, the procession ceased to take place, or rather was limited to a rotation around the baptismal font, and to a transition from it to the sacred bēma, either for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy or, after the separation of baptism from it, for the recitation of the readings and the communion of the newly illumined. The simple original circular rotation was very easily developed into a triple one because of the sacredness of the number, as certain later manuscripts attest ("And they circle him around three times," *M. Lavras 88, Athens 667*, and "And they do this three times," *Athens 665*), as well as Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki ("He joyfully takes the one baptized again by the hand, accompanied by the sponsor, and, while doing a circular dance, as one joined in dance by and rejoicing with the angels, circles the baptismal font three times, rejoicing over the spiritual mother[291] and over the one who has been born by the Divine Spirit out of her. And he sings, 'As many of you that have been baptized into Christ…,' with those chanting" *Dialogue*, chapter 67).[292] It was a kind of small procession that was reminiscent of the old great one.

So, the local tradition, which the inquirer mentions, preserves an older practice, a precursor of the present one. Wherever it is still preserved, it is to be respected and observed.

## 421

**Why are the same pericopes of the Apostolos and Gospel book repeated several times a year in the daily readings during the**

291. "πνευματικῇ μητρί." The term "spiritual mother" (τῇ πνευματικῇ μητρί) is an allegorical reference to the baptismal font (τὴν κολυμβήθραν), which is also a feminine noun in Greek. See also question 362.

292. PG 155:233a. Compare, John 3:5, "born of water and Spirit."

**Divine Liturgy, while others, equally significant, are not read at all?**

The system of pericopes of the Apostolos and Gospel book for reading in the Divine Liturgy has the one liturgical year as a basis. Namely, the Fathers, who established the sequence of readings, attempted to thus apportion the pericopes so that the entire New Testament is read during divine worship (apart from Revelation) in an annual cycle. This was done with the system of the continuous reading of holy Scripture, which begins from the Sunday of Pascha with the Gospel according to John and the Acts of the Apostles and which is continued throughout the year with the remaining evangelists (Matthew, Luke, and Mark), the Epistles of the Apostle Paul, and the Catholic Epistles. In the first part of the Evangelistaria[293] and of the Praxapostoloi,[294] namely, the liturgical books of the Gospel and Apostolos, one sees how the editors of the system of pericopes conceived and accomplished this objective. We emphasize what we said above that the reading of the entire New Testament was their goal. The word of God that is contained in the New Testament must be heard complete during church synaxes and constitutes a subject of interpretation for and teaching of the people of God by responsible teachers of the Church.

However, the distribution of this material, in as many pericopes as there are also days of the year on which the Divine Liturgy is celebrated, presupposes either monastic or parish communities where they come on a daily basis to the temple in order to participate in the mystery of the Holy Eucharist and in the hearing of the sacred readings connected with the Liturgy. This practice continues in monasteries. However, for various reasons in parish temples, Christians attend church only on Sundays and great feasts. Thus, they do not have the opportunity to hear the reading—and the interpreta-

293. For a definition and discussion of the term, "Evangelistarion" (Εὐαγγελιστάριον, το), see the glossary in the sixth volume.

294. The Praxapostolos (Πραξαπόστολος) is a lectionary used only at the Divine Liturgy, which contains the New Testament readings apart from the gospels and the book of Revelation, see Robert Taft, "Praxapostolos," *ODB* 2:1712–1713.

tion—of the entire New Testament, but only a small part of it, the 52 pericopes of Sundays and a few others, namely, not one sixth of the entire sacred text. After the Second Vatican Council, these new circumstances guided the Roman Catholic Church— which also had a similar system of pericopes, organized on an annual basis, and which for this reason presented similar disadvantages—to create a new system on a triennial cycle, based only on Sundays and feasts.

We write these points as introductory in order to show the difficulty that the entire question presents. Namely, while in principle the daily pericopes constitute an integral element of the Church's entire program for the reading of the holy Scriptures, and while the Church's primary goal is for the entire New Testament to be read, in practice this goal is only realized in the monasteries, because there, the necessary conditions exist for this. And for us once more to discuss the daily pericopes, it seemed that in practice very little can benefit us, since only the pericopes of Sundays and great feasts will be heard by the people. However, the topic has great theoretical, historical, but also substantive interest.

But in any case, however much the daily readings have limited practical–pastoral value for the parishes, they must not cease to concern us, just as the question correctly raises the topic.

The repetition of the same pericopes is not owed to the system for the continuous reading of holy Scripture, which we saw at the beginning of the answer. According to this system, the same pericopes are not repeated, but all the parallel ones are read. An account or a teaching, which is preserved by the three Synoptic Gospels or also by John, is also read in its three or four parallels, when its sequence comes in the reading of the gospels. This is most apparent especially in Great Week or the eves of the Nativity and Theophany, and the Matins and Divine Liturgies of the feasts of the Lord, where pericopes from additional evangelists, which relate to the sacred events being celebrated, are read in parallel.

The repetition of the same gospel or epistle pericopes in daily Liturgies is due to the system of the selective reading of the New Testament that follows the course of the calendar year from September 1st up until August 31st. For the feasts of this annual cycle, (feasts

of the Lord, Mother of God, and of the saints), appropriate—where possible—readings have been chosen. A criterion for their choice was the attribute of the saint, apostle, prophet, martyr, hierarch, blessed one, and so forth. Thus, for the same categories of saints, the same pericopes are often repeated.

A boundary is certainly fixed by the Typikon, where it restricts the reading of the special readings for the saints only to the saints "being celebrated," namely, to those where the chanting of the great doxology is provided for during Matins.[295] However, this boundary is easily moved. And we see from our liturgical books and ascertain from practice that a saint "not celebrated" very easily becomes "celebrated." The standard rubric is often inserted into the Mēnaia: "if the saint is celebrated" or "if you wish, perform a great doxology." Formerly, they chanted apolytikia of much fewer saints during Matins and they made their commemoration during the dismissal. A name day celebration or an icon or a fragment of a saint's relic changes the service of a saint into a festal one. Moreover, in parish temples, as far as I know, they find it more practical and easier, and, perhaps in order to save time, to chant lauds—if necessary, with the Vespers stichēra—and the great doxology, and from there to proceed to the Divine Liturgy, while omitting the plērōtika, the aposticha, the trisagion, and the rest of Matins. Thus, the instances of reading the readings of saints are proliferating, and consequently also the repetitions of the same pericopes.

To show the level that this practice has reached, we made a small statistical survey of the Typikon in use, taking as an example a period of a hundred days of the year 1983. We are relying on the *Calendar-Typikon of the Church of Greece* of this year.[296] We are randomly choosing the time period from September 19th (Monday, First Week of Luke) up until December 27th. We subtract the fourteen Sundays from these one hundred days, and eighty-six weekdays remain. Of these eighty-six days, for which eighty-five liturgies are provided for

295. On "celebrated" saints, see also questions 131, 154, 173, 174, 341, 342, 343, 369, 560, and 595.

296. *Ἡμερολόγιον-Τυπικὸν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος).

(December 23rd does not have a Liturgy because of the Great Hours of the Nativity), with an equal number of epistle and gospel readings, only ten epistle readings are of the day, namely, from the continuous reading of the epistles, while seventy-five are readings of the feast or of saints being celebrated. Moreover, the gospel pericopes come to half-and-half: forty-one from the continuous reading and forty-four from pericopes of feasts and celebrated saints. Now, of these pericopes of the epistles for celebrated saints, one (Eph 6:10–17) is read nine times within the same period, even on consecutive days (September 20, 27, October 12, 13, 14, November 15, December 10, 13, 14), two are read five times (1 Cor 4:9–16: October 6, November 10, 14, 16, and 30—Heb 11:33–12:2: October 7, 17, 24, November 7, December 17), one, four times (2 Tim 1:8–18: September 22, October 15, November 28, December 15), four, three times (2 Cor 4:6–15: September 28, November 11 and 26—2 Cor 9:6–11: October 21, November 4 and 12—Gal 5:22–6:2: September 29, October 20, December 5—2 Tim 2:1–10: October 20, 26, November 18), and seven, two times (Gal 3:23–4:5: November 5, December 22—Gal 4:22–27: September 23, December 9—Eph 5:8–19: October 8, December 12—2 Thess 2:13–3:5: December 7 and 8—Heb 7:26–8:2: October 4 and 22—Heb 10:32–38: November 5 and 9—Heb 13:7–16: November 23, December 17). Indeed, two of the same epistle pericopes are also repeated on the Sundays of this period (Gal 3:23–4:5: December 4—Heb 7:26–8:2: November 13). But let us note that also at least twenty-seven of these epistle pericopes of the feasts are repetitions of pericopes from the Sundays of the year.

| Epistle Pericope | Number of Times Read | Dates |
|---|---|---|
| Eph 6:10–17 | 9 | September 20, 27, October 12, 13, 14, November 15, December 10, 13, 14 |
| 1 Cor 4:9–16 | 5 | October 6, November 10, 14, 16, and 30 |
| Heb 11:33–12:2 | 5 | October 7, 17, 24, November 7, December 17 |
| 2 Tim 1:8–18 | 4 | September 22, October 15, November 28, December 15 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2 Cor 4:6–15 | 3 | September 28, November 11 and 26 |
| 2 Cor 9:6–11 | 3 | October 21, November 4 and 12 |
| Gal 5:22–6:2 | 3 | September 29, October 20, December 5 |
| 2 Tim 2:1–10 | 3 | October 20, 26, November 18 |
| Gal 3:23–4:5 | 2 | November 5, December 22 |
| Gal 4:22–27 | 2 | September 23, December 9 |
| Eph 5:8–19 | 2 | October 8, December 12 |
| 2 Thess 2:13–3:5 | 2 | December 7 and 8 |
| Heb 7:26–8:2 | 2 | October 4 and 22 |
| Heb 10:32–38 | 2 | November 5 and 9 |
| Heb 13:7–16 | 2 | November 23, December 17 |

Of the gospel pericopes again of this period, one is read five times (John 10:9–16: October 4, November 9, December 12, 16, and 17), three, three times (Luke 6:17–23: September 28, October 21, December 6—Luke 10:38–42–11:27–28: September 24, October 28, November 21—Luke 21:12–19: September 20, October 12, November 2), and five, two times (Matt 10:1, 5–8: November 1 and 17—Matt 11:27–30: October 20, December 5—Luke 10:16–21: October 1, November 8—Luke 12:2–12: October 25, November 3—John 15:17–16:2: October 26 and November 24).

| Gospel Pericope | Number of Times Read | Dates |
|---|---|---|
| John 10:9–16 | 5 | October 4, November 9, December 12, 16, and 17 |
| Luke 6:17–23 | 3 | September 28, October 21, December 6 |
| Luke 10:38–42–11:27–28 | 3 | September 24, October 28, November 21 |
| Luke 21:12–19 | 3 | September 20, October 12, November 2 |
| Matt 10:1, 5–8 | 2 | November 1 and 17 |
| Matt 11:27–30 | 2 | October 20, December 5 |
| Luke 10:16–21 | 2 | October 1, November 8 |
| Luke 12:2–12 | 2 | October 25, November 3 |
| John 15:17–16:2 | 2 | October 26 and November 24 |

An analogous frequency of omitting the sequentially read pericopes and repeating the same or other pericopes from the selective readings is also observed in other periods of the year 1983 and in all years. Let it be noted that during the one hundred days, which we took as an example, that with the system of continuous reading, nearly eight entire epistles of the Apostle Paul (13th–27th week: 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy) and a great portion of the gospels of Luke (chapters 3–19) and Mark (chapters 8–10) ought to be read. Of these, only eighteen instead of the ninety-nine epistle readings and almost half of the gospels were read, but instead of them the same constantly stereotypical pericopes were repeated *ad nauseum*. Namely, the wrongdoing is twofold: on the one hand, the omission of the sequential readings of the New Testament, but on the other, the repetition of the same readings, a situation of voluntary poverty within a fabulous biblical richness.

We do not wish to say that the *Calendar-Typikon* is wrong. On the contrary, those who took care of its compilation accurately implemented the rubrics of the Typikon. The problem lies elsewhere, namely, in how these rubrics must be interpreted for those saints "celebrated." There is no issue regarding the great feasts of the Lord and Mother of God and the commemorations of important saints (John the Theologian, the archangels, Saint Dēmētrios, Andreas, Nikolaos, and so forth, which fall during this period). But one cannot say the same regarding saints such as Grēgorios of Armenia, Ananias, Hierotheos, Probos, Karpos, Arethas, Markianos, Akepsimas, Gourias,[297] and many others that I am not even sure are celebrated anywhere or even whether their icons exist in our temples. Because they happen to have a doxastikon in the Mēnaia or a doxology in the Matins, is this sufficient for them to be characterized as celebrated and for their readings to prevail over the readings of the day? If some

297. When transliterated from the Syriac, this Edessan martyr commonly appears as "Guria." For a discussion of this martyr, see Susan Ashbrook Harvey, "The Edessan Martyrs and Ascetic Tradition," OCA 236 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990), 195–206.

temple exists in their name or if their commemoration is honored somewhere in private, their readings could also be read there. Otherwise, the readings of the day from the sequential reading of the epistles and gospels take precedence.

I think that this is the spirit of the standard rubrics concerning the reading of holy Scripture. Priority is given to the sequential reading, and very correctly so. This is evident from the entire relevant tradition, by the prior ordering of the sequential reading in the Apostolos and Gospel book, and by the rules that govern the choice of readings on Sundays. There would be no problem if double readings were read as occurred in ancient practice and as occurs up until now on the Holy Mountain. Thus, the epistle and gospel of the week would always be said, and afterwards the epistle and gospel of the saints, if they are being celebrated. However, since wrongly, as I think, this system has been abolished in the parishes (rather, by the *Typikon* of Kōnstantinos),[298] I hold the opinion that the only cure of the problem, with the present parish liturgical capabilities, would be that the pericopes of the day always be noted in the Typikon and for them to take priority at the time of the readings. The pericopes of the saints should also be noted, and these read, if and where the saints are celebrated. Thus, both the continuous reading of the holy Scripture would not be circumvented, as essentially takes place nowadays, and the repetition of the same pericopes would disappear or, at least, be rarer.

The topic of readings during divine worship is complex. From what I wrote, only one side of their problems was clear, the need for their solution, the difficulties that they present, but also the great practical importance that this has for the life of the Church. The need of its study and of the pursuit of correct solutions for the rearrangement of the system of pericopes has long been noted by our Church. For this reason, this is also listed among the topics of the Holy and Great Council that will convene in the future.[299]

---

298. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874).

299. This topic was not addressed by the Holy and Great Council of 2016.

## 422

**Must a petition be done before the kathismata of the trinitarian canon of the Sunday Midnight Office, or not?**

The canons are a hymnological form, a poetic composition, which consists of a set of troparia that have a specific liturgical purpose. For this reason, a specific form is followed in their composition, a predetermined "canon," from where it takes its name. Just as the Vespers stichēra are intended to adorn the chanting of the Lamp-lighting psalms (Psalms 140, 141, 129, and 116) and to be inserted into their last ten, eight, or six verses and just as the stichēra of lauds are put together with and adorn the chanting of the psalms of lauds (148, 149, 150) in Matins, so also the system of troparia of the canons are composed and intended to adorn the chanting of the nine odes of the Psalter. According to the predetermined sequence of these odes (First ode of Moses "Let us sing unto the Lord...,"[300] Second ode "Give heed, O heavens...,"[301] Third prayer of Anna "My heart was made firm...,"[302] and so forth) these troparia are also composed, apportioned to nine odes (often eight because the second is omitted as mournful), and inserted into the verses of the odes according to their stichologia. This was the original old taxis, which is preserved even nowadays in the monasteries of the Holy Mountain. The nine (or eight) odes constitute an organic element of the service of Matins, during which they are also recited. They are divided there into three "staseis," according to the model of the kathismata of the Psalter, each one of which has three odes: first, (second), third—fourth, fifth, sixth—seventh, eighth, ninth (α', [β'], γ' — δ', ε', ς' — ζ', η', θ'). Again, according to the same model, petitions (small synaptē), exclamations, "intermediate" troparia, kathismata between the third and fourth odes, and a kontakion between the sixth and seventh are inserted between their staseis. In other words, the petitions and exclamations are elements of the liturgical framework, within which the stichologia of the nine (eight) odes and the chanting associated

300. "Ἄσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ..."
301. "Πρόσεχε, οὐρανέ..."
302. "Ἐστερεώθη ἡ καρδία μου..."

with them of the canons—of their stichēra—during the service of Matins are integrated.

The canons were used as independent hymnological compositions in divine worship—as we saw, without this being their original liturgical purpose—and outside their natural liturgical framework, namely, of the stichologia of the odes during the service of Matins. This is a second, later liturgical use of the canon. Thus, canons were chanted chiefly in the services of Compline (Akathist, Great Canon, triōdia of Great Week, canon of communion, and Theotokarion), of the Midnight Office (trinitarian canons of Sundays), at the end of Vespers, or even in processions. In these instances, they retain or do not retain the intermediate kathismata or kontakia. However, a petition (prayer) and exclamation do not precede, as also the stichologia of the odes does not take place, precisely because these organically belong, as we said, to the service of Matins.

For this reason, before the intermediate kathismata of the trinitarian canons of the Midnight Office of Sunday, petitions and exclamations are not done. The canon is chanted, or read, the kathismata are inserted after the third and sixth odes, one after the other, just as in the Paraklētikē.

Petitions are only done in the services of the Paraklēseis after the third ode of the paraklētikos canon and before the kathisma, and after the sixth ode before the kontakion, because this service is structured according to the model of Matins. It is a type of paraklētikos Matins of the Mother of God.

We have something similar in the service of unction. In its first part, there exists a canon with kathismata after the third ode and a kontakion after the sixth. Here, this is actually a Matins service and normally a petition and exclamation ought to come before the kathismata and kontakion. However, this is not done in practice, and very correctly so, because it is no longer chanted as a Matins service, but as a preparatory, as it were, service for the celebration of unction. Otherwise, the litany of peace before the "Alleluia" (the Euchologion provided for a "small synaptē"), the other synaptes (for example, preceding the exaposteilaria), and the remaining elements of Matins also ought to be said, but they are correctly omitted.

## 423

**What relation do the pericopes of the gospels of the Sundays of Luke have with those of the Nativity, and the pericopes of the Sundays of Great Lent with Pascha?**

1. In the forefeast period, during which quite a number of them fall, the pericopes of the gospels of the Sundays of Luke were not selected on the basis of the feast of the Nativity. At the time when the system of pericopes was established, the forefeast period of the forty days of the Nativity had not yet been developed in imitation of Great Lent with fasting, forefeast troparia, and the frequent commemorations of the prophets. If it[303] had existed, it is very possible that the selection of the pericopes would have been influenced by it. The feast of the Nativity, as well as that of Theophany and of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, had only two Sundays as an initial liturgical framework, one forefeast and one afterfeast, the present-day Sundays "before the Birth of Christ" and "after the Birth of Christ." It is worth noting that the gospel pericopes of both these Sundays together with both pericopes of the days of the feast (Matins and Divine Liturgy) are the four also taken from the Gospel according to Matthew (1:1–25, 1:18–25, 2:1–20, 2:13–23) and exhaust the historical subject of the Nativity, from Christ's genealogy to the holy family's return to Nazareth. In other words, this constitutes a compact group of festal readings, which is inserted into the liturgical year and interrupts the sequence of readings of the Sundays of Luke.

During the tenth century, the festal topic of the Sunday before the Birth of Christ—which was the "commemoration of our holy fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob" (for which reason also it was called "Sunday of the Holy Fathers"), as well as also the commemoration "of the Three Holy Youths, Ananias, Azarias, and Misaël, and Daniel the prophet" (by transfer from December 17)—is also allocated to yet another forefeast Sunday, the present-day Sunday of the Forefathers. At that time, an attempt was made for a pericope from the Gospel according to Matthew (Matt 8:5–13, parable of the great

303. The period of forty days with fasting, forefeast troparia, and the frequent commemorations of the prophets.

supper) to be also imported to this Sunday, in imitation of the feast of the Nativity and of the two Sundays before and after the feast. This pericope referred to the forefathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Matt 8:11). However, more conservative Typika provided for the reading of the "regular"[304] gospel of Luke, namely, of the sequential pericope of the Sunday, without distinction. The modern taxis was formed from a combination of the above two: while the sequence of Luke remained, the pericope of the Eleventh Sunday comes from a transfer to replace the "regular" one. The pericope of the Eleventh Sunday of Luke is a parallel to Matthew 8:5–13 but does not mention the names of the forefathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

In a somewhat later era, consistent with the same system, the Sunday before the Sunday of the Forefathers was integrated into the forefeast period of the Nativity. On it, the gospel of the Tenth Sunday of Luke again by a transfer was read, which is referring to the cure of the woman bent double,[305] for the reason that she is characterized by the Lord as a daughter of Abraham ("who is a daughter of Abraham," Luke 13:16).

When December has five Sundays, the gospel of the Fourteenth Sunday of Luke (18:35–43, cure of the blind man of Jericho) is read, again by transfer, on the first Sunday of the month, obviously for the description twice of the Lord by the blind man as a son of David.

In this way, with the system of transfer, without the period of Luke generally being disrupted, all of the Sundays of December are adjusted to the forefeast period of the Nativity, since their gospel pericopes refer, even incidentally, to the names of the forefathers of Christ, of David, Abraham, and the other patriarchs and men of the Old Testament, to whom the period before the Nativity, and especially December, is dedicated. This may appear insufficient, but the practice of the Church preferred this solution over one making more radical changes to the preexisting system of pericopes, when introducing forefeasts and more appropriate pericopes from other evangelists.

304. "ἐνορδίνου."
305. "τῆς συγκυπτούσης." (BDAG, s.v. "συγκύπτω").

The answer to question 179 deals with the whole problem of transfers of Sundays of Luke.

2. The gospel readings of the Sundays of Great Lent, as attested to by the ancient Evangelistaria and by the old hymnography of these Sundays, were not from the outset the present ones. The First Sunday of the Fast alone retained its old gospel reading (John 1:44–52), which does not refer to the celebration of the restoration of the holy icons (Sunday of Orthodoxy), but to the commemoration of the prophets Moses, Aaron, and Samuel (see "him of whom Moses in the law and also the prophets wrote," verse 46),[306] which was the old subject of the day. The epistle (Heb 11:24–26, 32–40), the prokeimenon, the allēlouarion, and quite a few old troparia of this Sunday also refer to the prophets. The other Sundays (Second, Third, Fourth, and Fifth of the Fast) had other gospels from Luke, respectively the parables of the Prodigal Son, the Publican and the Pharisee, the Good Samaritan, and the Rich Man and Lazarus, as it appears also from the hymnography of these Sundays and of the weeks which follow them. Where, when, and why these changes in the gospel pericopes of Lent took place is not precisely known, because the question has not been sufficiently studied. In any case, it presupposes a general reordering of the system of readings in the periods of Mark and Luke since the readings above are already contained in the sequential readings of the Sundays of Luke. At any rate during the tenth century, as we ascertain from the Typikon of Saint Sophia from this period, the present-day epistle and gospel readings during the Sundays of Great Lent were read in the Great Church. Perhaps, these changes occurred so that the gospel readings might be more aligned with the themes of Great Lent and so that the last two might be joined with the Passion and Pascha, as we saw also takes place in the forefeast period of the Nativity.

We have already spoken regarding the gospel of the First Sunday of the Fast. The commemoration of the prophets is associated with the festal theme of the Sunday of Cheesefare, the fall of the first-

306. This is the verse numbering according to the text of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, *Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη ἐγκρίσει τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1912), 212.

formed[307] and God's providence afterwards for the race of humanity (see the Liturgy of Basileios the Great: "sending prophets...giving the law for assistance"[308]).

The gospel pericope of the Second Sunday of the Fast (Mark 2:1–12, healing of the paralytic of Capernaum) obviously is not related to Pascha, but to the central theme of Great Lent; repentance and remission of sins. Christ is the son of man, who has authority "to remit sins on earth" (verse 10, compare also verses 5–9).

The reading of the Third Sunday which refers to the Cross of the Lord (Mark 8:34–9:1) that is venerated on this day (Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross) either because the commemoration of its discovery was transferred to this day from March 6, or because—perhaps not by chance or without relevance to the transferred feast of the discovery—the transfer of the "precious woods"[309] during the sixth century from Apameia to Constantinople coincided with this day. The Cross of Christ and the crucified life of his followers in imitation of the Lord is one of the main themes that permeates the period of Great Lent.

The gospel pericope of the Fourth Sunday (Mark 9:17–31) has a thematic connection with Lent, the struggle against the devil and the spiritual weapons of prayer and fasting (verse 29), according to the words of the Lord, with which alone he[310] can be conquered. The first premonition of Christ regarding His Passion on the Cross and His Resurrection is contained at the end of the pericope.

---

307. "πρωτοπλάστων." Adam and Eve.

308. "προφήτας ἐξαπέστειλας...νόμον ἔδωκας εἰς βοήθειαν."

309. "τιμίων ξύλων." According to Orthodox tradition, the "precious woods" of Christ's Cross consisted of cedar, pine, and cypress, which were regarded as prefigured in Isaiah 60:13. This tradition is reflected in the third troparion from the seventh ode of Matins for the Wednesday of the Fourth Week of the Triōdion, " Ὡς κυπάρισσον, συμπάθειαν ὡς κέδρον τε, πίστιν ἡδύπνοον, ὡς πεύκην ἀληθινήν, ἀγάπην προσφέροντες, τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου Σταυρόν, προσκυνήσωμεν, τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ δοξάζοντες, Λυτρωτὴν προσηλωθέντα" (While offering sympathy as the cypress, fragrant faith as the cedar, true love as the pine, let us venerate the Cross of the Lord, while giving glory to the Redeemer who was nailed on it).

310. The devil.

On the Fifth Sunday of the Fast we clearly have a forefeast pericope (Mark 10:32–45), since it begins and ends with the prophecy in more detail concerning "what was to happen to him" (verse 32). In these last two Sundays, the parallel with the two forefeast Sundays of the Nativity is very clear.

## 424

**What does the word "ῥοδισμός"[311] mean and what is its relation to the feast of Saint John the Theologian (May 8 — verses of the synaxarion)?**

We encounter the word, "ῥοδισμός," (from "ῥόδον" — rose) in our printed liturgical Mēnaia in the third verse of the Mēnologion of May 8th for Saint John the Theologian: "ὀγδοάτῃ τελέουσι ῥοδισμὸν βροντογόνοιο," which means, "on the eighth day [of May] they celebrate ῥοδισμόν for the son of thunder" (namely, John, Mark 3:17). In the manuscript synaxaria, this commemoration of the Theologian as "ῥοδισμός," is specified ("Commemoration of the holy apostle... that is to say, ὁ ῥοδισμός). From what is said in the synaxaria of the Mēnaia regarding the connection of "ῥοδισμός" with "harvesting of the manna,"[312] namely, of the sacred powder that gushed forth miraculously on that day from his tomb, it becomes clear that this is a feast that took place in Ephesos at the great temple, where also the tomb of the apostle was located. In the Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople from the tenth century, "ῥοδισμός" is recorded twice, on May 9th in the commemoration of the patriarch Timotheos ("ῥοδισμός of Saint Timotheos the patriarch") and on the Second Sunday after Pentecost, "the so-called ῥοδισμός of Saint Theodōros among those of Sparakios."[313] In inscriptions, the verb "ῥοδίζειν" is also encountered.

311. In its ancient usage, the word means, "ceremony at which graves were decked with roses," (LSJ, s.v "ῥοδισμός, ὁ").

312. "τριγύσεως τοῦ μάννα."

313. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*,1:286–287, 2:146–147. Σπαράκιος or Σφωράκιος was a fifth century patrician who gave his name to a city quarter of Constantinople (τὰ Σφορακίου). The phrase, "ἐν τοῖς Σπαρακίου," refers here to the ῥοδισμός that took place in the temple of Saint Theodōros located in this quarter of Constantinople, which also included a

This is the decoration of tombs of saints or more generally of tombs of the dead with roses, which naturally used to take place during the season for roses, namely, during the months of May–June. All the above "ῥοδισμοί" are appointed on days for the month of May, but the Second Sunday after Pentecost falls according to the Julian Calendar between May 24th and June 27th.[314] It appears that the custom was quite widespread if we can judge from the above witnesses and from other sources that refer to a similar practice regarding the feast of Saint Theodosia (May 29). In the stichēra of the lauds for the services of the Blessed Mytilenian brothers by birth, David, Symeōn, and Geōrgios, which is found in codex 9,21 from the fourteenth century, of the Laurentian Library of Florence, there exists information regarding a miracle that occurred during the "ῥοδισμός" of their tombs in their monastery on Mytilene. The "presider"[315] decided to "anoint" their common shrine, placing roses inside it: "When with roses the presider* decided to anoint* the myron vial of the bones,* out of affection for you* he brought these things into the shrine."[316] However, the saints were not pleased by this display of honor; they made the roses appear to be "fetid" and miraculously gushed forth myron: "As fetid for you* you made the

chapel dedicated to Saint John the Forerunner. For a discussion of this city quarter and the temple of Saint Theodōros, see Raymond Janin, "Les sanctuaires de Byzance sous la domination latine (1204–1261)," *Études byzantines* 2 (1944): 183; Raymond Janin, *La Géographie Ecclésiastique de L'empire Byzantin*, vol. 1, *Le Siège de Constantinople et Le Patriarcat Oecuménique*, pt. 3, Les Églises et Les Monastères, 2nd ed. (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1969), 440–441; and, most recently, Dirk Krausmüller, "Making the Most of Mary: The Cult of the Virgin in the Chalkoprateia from Late Antiquity to the Tenth Century," in *The Cult of the Mother of God in Byzantium, Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Studies*, ed. Leslie Brubaker and Mary B. Cunningham (New York: Routledge, 2011), 226.

314. See also question 405.

315. "ὁ προεστώς." See question 302.

316. "Ῥόδοις ὁ προεστώς* ολόμενος μυρίζεν* ὀστῶν τὴν μυροθήκην,* ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκ πόθου* ταῦτα προσῆγεν ἐν τῇ λάρνακι." The translation above follows the order of the sung stichēra, but can read more understandably, "When the presider decided to anoint with roses the 'myron vial' of the bones, he brought these things into the shrine out of affection for you."

roses appear* once these were removed, with myron* divine the myron vial* anoints those who approach."[317]

In the Roman and Greek pagan world, a feast took place during the same period of the year (May–June) that was called with a Latin name, "Rosalia" or "Rosaria," because it appears to have had its origins in Italy. They conducted religious processions, decorated the tombs with roses, and held banquets for the dead. Christians also received from them the custom of the ῥοδισμός and of meals for the dead. Such a display of love and honor for the dead is so human, and naturally, for a greater reason, would be done for the saints. The offering of flowers—and of roses—on the tombs of saints and beloved persons, which takes place also nowadays, is a contemporary form and survival of the ancient ῥοδισμός.

## 425

**How must the abbess in women's monasteries be commemorated in the litany of peace and so forth, or must she not be commemorated?**

I do not think that there exists any traditionally verified and established form of commemorating the abbess of women's monasteries, or at least, such a form has not been found recorded anywhere. Perhaps this is due to the inconsistency that—as I have noted—is observed in present-day practice. In any case, the form that is in use for men's monasteries is not acceptable to be implemented by analogy here: "For our father [name] the priest-monk…"[318] or "For our abbot…."[319] This would be appropriate in the mouths of the nuns, but not also in the mouths of the priest or the deacon, who are neither members of the female sisterhood in order to call her "our abbess," nor also is it fitting in their priestly rank to call her "our mother."

317. "Ὡς δύσοσμα δ' ὑμεῖς* ἐδείξατε τὰ ῥόδα,* ὧν ἐκβληθέντων μύροις* θείοις ἡ μυροθήκη* μυρίζει τοὺς προστρέχοντας." In more understandable English, this can read, "You made the roses appear fetid for you, and once they were removed the 'myron vial' [tomb-shrine] anoints those who approach with divine myron."

318. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν δεῖνα ἱερομονάχου…"

319. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ καθηγουμένου ἡμῶν…"

Still, the omission of the petition, due to the difficulty that it presents, is not appropriate.

I have the opinion that the most widespread form, "For the abbess of this holy monastery [name] the nun and of her community,"[320] is the only correct or at least the most satisfactory one.

## 426

**When the hierarch attends church privately within the holy bēma, is it correct for "Through the prayers of our holy master..."[321] to be said during the dismissal?**

I would not repeat what I wrote in the answer to question 110 regarding the meaning and use of this "phrase" in connection with its replacement with "Christ is risen..."[322] during the Paschal period.

Inasmuch as the hierarch does not serve or does not officiate, and consequently does not say "Through the prayers of our holy fathers...,"[323] in a sense relying humbly on the prayers of the fathers and priests present (this is the principal meaning of the "phrase"), it is very natural also that the due reciprocation of this sacred courtesy does not take place by those for whom it is addressed, with "Through the prayers of our holy master...." In the monasteries, we find the same reciprocity—for us to characterize it this way—and noble emulation in the display of Christian humility, from where this form also originates, with "Through the prayers of our holy fathers...," constituting the abbot's response to, "Through the prayers of our holy father..."[324] at the trapeza and in many other instances.

As is self-evident, these things are said when the hierarch or abbot are present. Quite correctly, it is always done this way in practice. If he is not present, the use of both of these clearly personal

320. "Ὑπὲρ τῆς καθηγουμένης τῆς ἱερᾶς μονῆς ταύτης [δεῖνα] μοναχῆς καὶ τῆς συνοδείας αὐτῆς." As a "συνοδεία" (community, fellowship, those journeying in company, assembly), the monastic sisterhood follows her guidance (Lampe, s.v. "συνοδία, ἡ"). The word "συνοδία" had an alternate spelling as "συνοδεία" (LSJ, s.v. "συνοδία, ἡ").

321. "Δι' εὐχῶν τοῦ ἁγίου δεσπότου ἡμῶν..."

322. "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη..."

323. "Δι' εὐχῶν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν..."

324. "Δι' εὐχῶν τοῦ ἁγίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν..."

forms ("...of our holy master...," "...of our holy father...") is not imaginable. He is present when appearing formally in the synaxis. When he is found privately in the holy bēma, and with this action of his shows that he would not wish his presence to be felt, then how is it possible for the priest to address him publicly during the dismissal and formally ask his prayers, tactlessly, not respecting his privacy? This is like revealing him to be hiding himself and rudely forcing him to take part in the service.

Somewhat parallel is the instance of "May the Lord God remember your archpriesthood...,"[325] during the great entrance. Indeed, this would lead us also to the correct use of "Through the prayers..." in our case. Just as the serving priest who prays "May the Lord God remember your archpriesthood..." can and must privately address the hierarch within the holy bēma, so the priest can, and I think that he must, privately request from the hierarch a blessing or permission, as appropriate, or request for his prayer[326] to be called upon at the conclusion of the service. However, not publicly.

The sacred forms, when observed correctly, safeguard the dignity of the hierarch and priest, and also shield both from any kind of misunderstanding. They operate at a level of high nobility and mutual love and honor, but at the same time also genuine humility and mutual respect in Christ.

## 427

**For what reason during the period of the Gospel according to John or according to Luke, and so forth, are pericopes inserted from other evangelists, while from the titles for the periods it appears that this is precluded?**

Indeed, the individual titles for the periods of the "Gospel" (Evangelistarion or Eklogadion),[327] which come at the beginning of

325. "Τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης σου μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεός..."

326. "εὐχή." This request is equivalent to a blessing.

327. An Eklogadion (Ἐκλογάδιον, τό) is a lectionary of epistle and gospel readings. An Evangelistarion (Εὐαγγελιστάριον, τό) is an evangelistary, a book of gospel readings for liturgical use, or a table of such readings.

each period ("Divine and sacred Gospel according to John...,"[328] "...according to Matthew...,"[329] and so forth), give the impression that this concerns watertight compartments, namely, this concerns readings of pericopes only from the gospels of the period of the evangelist, which belongs to each one of the four groupings. This impression is also compounded by the icons of the evangelists and from the titles, which both in manuscripts and in printed editions are inserted between the groupings and separate them. It is undeniable that this division of the year into four periods according to the four evangelists exists. The pertinent tradition is summarized in an ancient rubric that we find in the Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople from the codices of *Timiou Staurou 40* and *Patmos 266* from the tenth century: "It is necessary to know that the gospels are read in this way: the Gospel according to John from Pascha up until the Fiftieth[330] [namely, Pentecost], the Gospel according to Matthew from the Fiftieth up until the new year [namely, the 23rd of September], the Gospel according to Luke from the new year until the Fasts, and the Gospel according to Mark from the Fasts until the Palms."[331] The insertion of pericopes from other evangelists into these periods of gospels must rather be characterized as exceptional; and quite a few such exceptions exist. We will try to explain them below, after naturally we first locate them.

The period of the Gospel according to John is the most regular, relatively speaking. It begins from the Sunday of Pascha and extends up until the Sunday of Pentecost. Throughout all these days, pericopes are read from the Gospel according to John, apart from three exceptions, which are also noted in the manuscripts: "One must know that the text of the Gospel according to John is read in all seven weeks, which are counted from the Great Sunday of Pascha, apart from three days," (*Codex Sinai 754*). These three days are Renewal Tuesday, the Sunday of the Myrrhbearing Women, and As-

328. "Θεῖον καὶ ἱερὸν Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ἰωάννην..."
329. "...κατὰ Ματθαῖον..."
330. "Ν'."
331. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:90–91. See question 179 regarding September 23, an equinox as reckoned new year's day.

cension Thursday. And the reason is clear regarding the Ascension; in the gospel of John, there is no reference to it. The narrative of Luke (24:36–52) was judged more appropriate, indeed in combination with the relevant pericope of Acts (1:1–12), together with which this constituted the pair of readings for the Liturgy of this feast.

The other two cases are more difficult. On Renewal Tuesday, the pericope of the gospel of Luke is read, which narrates the Lord's appearance to the ones travelling to Emmaus (Luke 24:12–35), namely, the fifth eōthinon gospel. The fact alone that this pericope is resurrectional does not justify its reading during Renewal Week. According to the system of reading in use during the week of Pascha, the Gospel of John is read, not the resurrectional pericopes. On the other hand, if the described event took place on the Tuesday after Pascha, its reading on that day would thus be explained. But this appearance of the Risen One took place on the same day as the Resurrection, Sunday, unless the passage 24:21, "it is now the third day today since these things happened" (namely, from Friday) was to be interpreted in the sense that it pertains to the Third day[332] from the Resurrection, which is hardly likely. And something else; from the sequential text of John, which is read from the Sunday of Pascha up until Renewal Wednesday (1:1–17, 18–28, and 35–52) precisely one pericope is absent (1:29–34 "...John sees...I have seen and bore witness that this is the Son of God"), which corresponds to Renewal Tuesday and which obviously they read on this day before it is replaced by the pericope of Luke. Why this change took place, we cannot know, at least with the evidence that up until now is known to us. The fact that the pericope of John 1:29–34 constitutes the reading of the Liturgy of January 7th (synaxis of the Forerunner) is not a strong reason for justifying its omission, since indeed also the pericope that immediately follows (John 1:35–52) is read both on Renewal Wednesday and in the Liturgy of the commemoration of the apostle Andrew (November 30). Instead, according to the Typikon of the temple of the Resurrection of Jerusalem (*Codex Timiou*

332. Phountoulēs capitalizes "Τρίτη" since in Modern Greek, this word for "third" can also mean (when capitalized), "Tuesday," namely, the third day of the week.

*Stavrou 43* from the year 1122), during Renewal Week, the eōthina gospels were read in Jerusalem during the Matins of these days.[333] If the change of the pericope that concerns us took place there, perhaps this could be interpreted as a survival of that practice or is due to some synaxis that took place on Renewal Tuesday in the village of Emmaus. However, the present-day taxis was already established during the tenth century, since it is attested to by the Typikon of Saint Sophia which we mentioned above.

The introduction of the pericope of Mark 15:43–16:8 to the Third Sunday from Pascha is owed to feast day calendar reasons. On this day, according to the above Typikon of Saint Sophia, the "commemoration of the righteous Joseph of Arimathea, Mary Magdalēnē, and the remaining women disciples of the Lord" is celebrated.[334] The synaxarion in the Pentēkostarion also adds Nikodēmos, the disciple "by night," and specifies the commemoration of the women disciples through the myrrhbearing women. On this Sunday, as attested to by the Jerusalemite–Georgian Kanonarion from the seventh century, originally the pericope John 2:1–11 was read, namely, the narrative regarding the Lord's miracle at the wedding at Cana of Galilee. Obviously also here, we have a later change in the themes of Sundays and in the pericopes that are read on them, perhaps an attempt for an immediate connection of the first two Sundays of Pentecost with the theme of Pascha, namely, the creation of two afterfeast Sundays. Joseph, Nikodēmos, and the myrrhbearers are put forward in the synaxarion and in the service of this Sunday as witnesses of the burial and Resurrection of Christ. Why now was Mark's narrative preferred over the parallel narrative of the Gospel according to John, as would be more natural? Perhaps because Mark's narrative is more concise (though Nikodēmos is not mentioned). Perhaps also because the myrrhbearing women are not referred to by John, but only Mary Magdalēnē is.

---

333. Α. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, 5 vols. (St. Petersburg: B. Κιρσπάουμ, 1891–1898), 2:211 (fourth), 220 (first), 227 (ninth), 235, 244 (tenth), 252 (eleventh).

334. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:114–115.

The sequential reading of the Gospel according to Matthew, which begins on the Monday of the Holy Spirit, appears coherent and without an exception up until the Eleventh Sunday. From there up until the Sixteenth Sunday the readings of the Gospel according to Mark on the weekdays begin, while the reading of the Gospel according to Matthew continues only on Saturdays and Sundays. Precisely the same thing also occurs with the Sundays and weeks of Luke, where from the beginning (Monday after the Sunday after the Exaltation) up until the Twelfth Sunday, we have a solid grouping and the Gospel according to Luke is read continuously without any exception. Once more, from the Monday of the Thirteenth Week the reading of the Gospel according to Mark is inserted during the weekdays at the point where it stopped on the Friday of the Sixteenth Week of Matthew (Mark 8:1–10), namely, from Mark 8:11. During the Saturdays and Sundays, pericopes are read from Luke, just as we saw also takes place in the period of Matthew. The Sunday of Meatfare has a pericope from the Gospel according to Matthew (25:31–41, of the future judgment), as also the Saturday and Sunday of Cheesefare (Matthew 6:1–13 and Matthew 6:14–21), while the weekdays of the week of Cheesefare (apart from Wednesday and Friday, which are liturgically void and for this reason do not have readings—earlier, a Presanctified was celebrated and also for this reason they do not have a epistle and gospel reading) return again to the end of the Gospel according to Luke.

Why now did these insertions from the gospel of Mark take place at the end of the periods of Matthew and Luke, and why again does the reading of Luke return during the week of Cheesefare? It is clear that these arrangements have a connection with the period of Great Lent and the gradual establishment of a preparatory period for it. Namely, they wished the period of Lent to remain as a period of continuous reading from the Gospel according to Mark, just as in our present-day Evangelistaria. However, from more ancient Evangelistaria and the old hymnography of the Sundays of the Fast and their weeks, we also know that pericopes from the Gospel according to Luke were read during it. However, since Lent has gospels only on Saturdays and Sundays, they transferred the sequential reading

of the gospel of Mark to the periods of the Gospel according to Matthew and according to Luke, while attempting to thus adjust the system of pericopes, so that the narrative of the Passion according to both these evangelists (Luke and Mark) comes before the beginning of Great Lent in order to prepare for it. Thus, during Great Week, the pericopes of the Passion and of the events that precede are taken overwhelmingly from the gospels of Matthew and John, of the evangelists who were witnesses of the events, where their relevant chapters remained intentionally outside the sequential reading of the gospels themselves during their period. Thus, only by exception are pericopes from Mark and Luke read during Great Week. With respect to the thirty-two gospel pericopes, which are read from the Saturday of Lazarus up until Great Saturday, fifteen are taken from the Gospel according to Matthew, eleven from the Gospel according to John, and just three each from the Gospel according to Mark and the Gospel according to Luke. Moreover, the preparatory period for Great Lent was constructed with the transfer of two pericopes of Luke, which formerly belonged to Great Lent (Pharisee and Publican—Prodigal Son), of two pericopes of Matthew (Future Judgement—Cheesefare), and even that of the Canaanite Woman, which is read almost always before the beginning of the Triōdion.

Finally, the period of the reading of the Gospel according to Mark is limited to five Saturdays and to an equal number of Sundays of the Fast. And here, however, there is an exception. On the First Sunday of the Fast, the pericope John 1:44–52 is read for the verse: "him of whom Moses in the law and also the prophets wrote, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph" (verse 46).[335] As we wrote in another context, on this Sunday, they celebrated the commemoration of the prophets Moses, Aaron, and the rest. This pericope was the only appropriate one, since in this reading, Jesus is recognized by his disciples as the one foretold by the prophets to be the Messiah.

That during the period of each evangelist, in principle they made an effort for the pericopes from the evangelist of the period to be read

335. This is the verse numbering according to the Patriarchal text, *Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη ἐγκρίσει τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1912), 212.

at least on the Sundays, this is also evident from the gospel readings of the Sundays of the Holy Fathers of the Ecumenical Councils. Thus, the pericope John 17:1–13 is read, a week from Pascha, on the Sunday of the Holy Fathers of the First Ecumenical Council, the pericope Matthew 5:14–19 on the Sunday of the Holy Fathers in July, and, by a transfer, the "gospel of the Sower" (Luke 8:5–15) on the Sunday of Holy Fathers in October, while they originally provided here for the reading of the pericope Matthew 5:14–19. The same thing also happens with the Sunday of the Forefathers, on which by transfer was placed the pericope of the Eleventh of Luke (14:16–24), instead of the parallel pericope Matthew 8:5–13, which is provided for by certain manuscripts and which was also more appropriate, because in it mention is made explicitly regarding the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (verse 11), who are celebrated together with the other forefathers of Christ on this Sunday.

## 428

**Can a partial consumption of the Holy Elements take place before the communion of the faithful?**

I do not see that any reason exists, even a practical one, which justifies the partial consumption of the Holy Elements before the communion of the faithful. According to the taxis, the priest communes first himself and afterwards calls the people to partake themselves in the undefiled mysteries. This is a uniform practice for the approach of clergy and people to holy communion, which begins with "The Holy Things are for the holy"[336] and the preparatory prayers, and is concluded with the diaconal exhortations and the prayer of thanksgiving. Formerly, this unity was more evident because it was not interrupted by the more modern, "With fear of God...."[337] Nor did the chanting of the koinōnikon stop after the communion of the priest, but was continued even after the laity's communion, as must take place also nowadays, if there exists a large attendance of people for the holy mysteries. The consumption of the remainders of Holy

336. "τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις."
337. "Μετὰ φόβου Θεοῦ..."

Communion takes place at the prothesis after the communion of all—formerly at the diakonikon—after the conclusion of the Divine Liturgy. Moreover, the holy table is neither the appropriate place traditionally nor also practically, for the consumption, even partial, of the Holy Elements.

## 429

**In the Great Hours of the eves of the Nativity, of Theophany, and of Great Friday, it is not indicated anywhere that the "Alleluia" is chanted after the epistle reading. If it must be chanted, why do the books not record this, and if it must not, what is the reason?**

The question, very precisely, is presented with two facets: The first relates to whether "Alleluia" is chanted during the Great Hours and the second, in the case of a negative answer, what the reason is for its omission.

1. In the first place, this silence of our liturgical texts is indeed strange. In the printed liturgical books neither on Great Friday nor during the eves of the Nativity and Theophany, is anything said regarding the "Alleluia" after the epistle reading and before the gospel of the Great Hours. If the reason for this was some printing mistake or omission, it would be unlikely that this mistake or omission would occur in these cases, namely, twelve times, since four services of Hours are chanted on each one of these three days. Moreover, the rubrics in all these cases are so detailed that they allow no room for the hypothesis that even a minor element of these services passed unnoticed. Indeed, a little below, in the description of the service of Vespers of these great feasts, which has, as well known, an epistle and a gospel reading, the indication will be given regarding the "Alleluia," the tone, and its "verses." The same thing occurs in all our liturgical books, in the Apostolos, Mēnaia, Triōdion, Pentēkostarion, and Euchologion. When a service has an epistle and gospel reading, necessarily indicated after the epistle is the tone and verse or verses of the "Alleluia." Hence, this takes place in the readings of Sundays,

feasts, weekdays (the "amnēma" allēlouaria),[338] and the mysteries and sacred rites of our Church, such as baptism, marriage, dedication,[339] unction, and Small and Great Hagiasmos, small and great monastic schēma, normal funeral service, funeral for priests and infants, and even in the "set of epistle and gospel readings"[340] of the processions for drought, an earthquake, liberation from barbarians, and so forth.

The question gains a special significance, when we make the obligatory retrospection into the ancient Typika, which also themselves describe the taxis of the Great Hours with all the details. For example, the Typika of Saint Sabas (*Codex Vatopediou 322/956* from the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries and published in Venice, 1771), the Monastery of Evergetis from the twelfth century, the temple of the Resurrection of Jerusalem from the year 1122, and the Monastery of the Savior in Messina from the year 1131, as well as the late manuscript Typika of the monasteries of the Holy Mountain, such as Dionysiou, Kōnstamonitou, Hagiou Pavlou, Xēropotamou, and Philotheou, give precisely the same impression as the printed editions furnish for us. Namely, while they note the "Alleluia" and one to four verses from the Psalms in all the instances for epistle–gospel readings, and certainly also in the Vespers of the Nativity, Theophany, and Great Friday, they lack the "Alleluia" in all the services of the Great Hours. Let us note that this consensus of the ancient Typika cannot be accidental, since certainly the taxis of the Great Hours, as described by them, is not precisely the same on other points, but presents diverse variations. It is also again worth noting that the Typikon of the temple of the Resurrection and the Typikon of the *Sinai Codex 1096,* from the twelfth century, provide for the chanting of prokeimena, but not of allēlouaria, before the gospels of the Great Hours. A Kanonarion/Typikon of the Church of Jerusalem, which was preserved in a Georgian translation, and

338. "τὰ ἄμνημα ἀλληλουάρια." "Ἄμνημος," which may be translated as "not commemorating," refers to allēlouaria chanted for epistle readings when the commemoration of a saint does not take place, namely, epistle pericopes from the system of sequential readings.

339. Dedication or consecration of a church.

340. "τὰ ἀποστολοευάγγελα." In this context, the term refers to sets of associated epistle and gospel readings.

dates back to the seventh century, does not have the service of the Great Hours on Great Friday, but rather a maternal form of the latter, which consists of twelve troparia, verses from the Psalms, and many readings. And here before the gospels, it has prokeimena and not "Alleluia." In the Vespers of Great Thursday, it expressly notes, "Alleluia is not said." Clearly following the same tradition, Nikolaos Malaxos, the prōtopapas of Nafplion, during the sixteenth century, composed services of the Great Hours for the feast of Pentecost without noting an allēlouarion in these services.[341]

Nowadays the "Alleluia" between an epistle and a gospel passes almost unnoticed, because it is chanted concisely and only three times, without special care regarding the tone of its chanting. The practice has decayed. According to the ancient Matins taxis, the "Alleluia" was chanted nine or twelve times (3x3 or 3x4), in a set tone and with prescribed special verses from the Psalms, which each time are recorded in the liturgical books and in manuscripts and which range from one up to three or four. The reader introduced it with the phrase, "Alleluia. Psalm of David,"[342] the deacon said, as also at the prokeimenon, "Wisdom. Let us attend,"[343] and during its chanting the censing was done, the prayer of the gospel was said, and the blessing of the deacon/gospeler and his transition to the ambōn occurred. Namely, it was a vital element, with a strong presence in the service and a specific liturgical purpose. No note of it in the services of the Great Hours means clearly that the "Alleluia" was not chanted during them, consequently that the prayer before the gospel was not said during the Great Hours, nor did the censing take place, but the

341. Nikolaos Malaxos (Νικόλαος Μαλαξός), born around 1500, educated in Constantinople, and elevated in 1538 as a protopresbyter of Nafplion. Afterwards, he lived in Venice where he served the Greek community of Saint Geōrgios while working with manuscripts and correcting printed editions of liturgical books. At the end of his life, around 1590, he served the temple of Saint Iōannēs the Forerunner on the island of Zakynthos. In addition to editing service books, his work included the composition of liturgical hymns (many of which are unpublished), services and lives of saints, and liturgical studies. For additional information, see Χ. Γ. Πατρινέλης, "Μαλαξός, Νικόλαος," *ΘΗΕ* 2:538.

342. "Ἀλληλούϊα. Ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαβίδ."

343. "Σοφία. Πρόσχωμεν."

priest read the gospel and not the deacon, as occurs up until nowadays. The witnesses of the liturgical books, in print and manuscript, are unanimous.

2. The answer to the second part of the question, why allēlouaria are not chanted during the Great Hours, is quite difficult, perhaps, by all appearances, even impossible.

I think that two possible explanations can be supported, but not completely satisfactorily. The one can be the mournful character of the Great Hours of Great Friday, which is found to be in antithesis to the doxological and joyful character of "Alleluia." The services of the Great Hours of the Nativity and Theophany have been created in imitation of the Great Hours of Great Friday and preserve in many respects the penitential character of the latter. However, "Alleluia" is not considered by our liturgical tradition only to be a joyous hymn, but also a penitential one. It replaces, as is well known, "God is the Lord..."[344] during the weekdays of Great Lent and during the first days of Great Week. And more importantly, it is also encountered, as we saw, in the Vespers of Great Friday itself. It is incomprehensible for it not to be chanted as joyful there, but here to be chanted as a penitential hymn.

Relatively and somewhat enlightening is what is written in § 43 of G. Violakēs's *Typikon of the Great Church of Christ*, M. Saliveros, in Athens 1921, p. 37:[345] "The omission of the Alleluia on the day of Pascha and on the remaining days of Renewal Week after the epistle and the koinōnikon, is found nowhere in the ancient Typika...and the choirs ought to chant this." From the points above, it appears that some consider its chanting improper on Pascha and during Renewal Week, obviously, either because they attributed a penitential character to it or because they were influenced by the Liturgy of Great Saturday, where, as is well known, "Arise O God, judge the earth..."[346] is chanted, while being intoned, according to the form of ancient prokeimena, with verses from Psalm 81, from which it

344. "Θεὸς Κύριος..."

345. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 37.

346. "Ἀνάστα, ὁ Θεός, κρίνων τὴν γήν..."

is also derived (verse 8). The Typikon in this case is certainly right, since in our liturgical books the "Alleluia" after the epistle, indeed every time with special joyful verses, is also noted for Pascha and for the days of Renewal Week.

A second explanation which can be supported is that the allēlouarion is an organic element of the Divine Liturgy. In this explanation, the allēlouarion announces in advance the hearing of the gospel reading and prepares for this, as the commentator Fathers on the Divine Liturgy teach (see Germanos of Constantinople, *Ecclesiastical History and Mystical Contemplation*: "Alleluia; herald of the gospel, crying 'The Lord is coming,'"[347] and Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Explanation,* 66: "The 'Alleluia' hymn is prior to the gospel, which in fact signifies a praise of God and a coming of divine grace, which is the reading of the gospel"[348]). Namely, it is a type of doxological prokeimenon of the gospel, which covers, as we have also written previously, the reading of the prayer before the gospel, the censing, the blessing of the deacon reading the gospel, and his transition to the ambōn. In the case of the Great Hours, neither is Liturgy celebrated nor a prayer before the gospel said, and the gospel is read by the priest before the beautiful gate. Of course, there was no censing either since it was done according to taxis during the chanting of idiomela. Contrariwise, during Vespers the "Alleluia" is chanted because while the Liturgy of the Presanctified was next celebrated in ancient times on Great Friday, the Liturgy of Basileios the Great is celebrated during the Vespers of the Nativity and Theophany, without exception. Moreover, the gospel of Vespers is said by the deacon from the ambōn and certainly the chanting of the allēlouarion also presupposes the offering of incense during it.

According to this explanation, generally more persuasive than the first, the chanting of the "Alleluia" is objectionable in other instances outside of the Divine Liturgy. And for the services of holy

347. PG 98:412c. For a discussion of authorship and text, see René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966), 125–180.

348. See the text and translation in Steven Hawkes-Teeples, ed./trans., *St. Symeon of Thessalonika, The Liturgical Commentaries, vol. 168 of Studies and Texts* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2011), 120–121.

baptism, marriage, monastic schēma, and dedication, it is without question that their epistle and gospel readings—and consequently the allēlouarion—do not belong organically to these services, but to the Divine Liturgy, with which they were always associated. However, for other instances (Hagiasmoi, unction, funeral services, and so forth), the same is not the case, at least in later practice.

From what we saw above, we conclude that it is certain that the "Alleluia" is not chanted before the gospel reading during the services of the Great Hours. However, the reason for which it is not chanted remains rather murky.

## 430

**The Typikon notes four times that, whenever the gospel of Zacchaeus is read, the epistle of the thirty-second Sunday is also read (edition of M. Saliveros, p. 157).[349] However, the epistle reading of the fifteenth Sunday is prescribed in the *Calendar* of the Church of Greece in 1983 (p. 32.)[350] How is this singular deviation justified?**

Indeed, the reading of the gospel of the Fifteenth of Luke together with the epistle of the thirty-second Sunday is provided for by the "Notes concerning Epistle and Gospel"[351] of the Typikon, to which the question refers. This rubric agrees with the table of associated readings[352] and with the tables of the kanonia,[353] which are printed at the end of the Gospel book (Evangelistaria). For the same reason, also, Metropolitan Gennadios (Arampatzoglou) of Ilioupoli in his study, "Foundations and guidelines for construction of the kanonion for every year with relevant tables" (*Orthodoxia*, vol. 13

349. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 157.

350. *Ἡμερολόγιον-Τυπικὸν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 1983), 32.

351. "Σημειώσεις περὶ Ἀποστόλου καὶ Εὐαγγελίου."

352. "ὁ πίναξ συναναγνώσεως."

353. "κανόνια, τά." For a definition and discussion of the term, "kanonion" (κανόνιον, τό), see the glossary in the sixth volume.

[1938], p. 385 and vol. 14 [1939], p. 23)[354] as well as Pankratios of Lefkes in his article, "Canons and guidelines for construction of the Paschal tables" (*Orthodoxia*, vol. 14 [1939], pp. 314 and 338)[355] completely follow the above rubric. This also is the case for the helpful Calendar-Typika, which are published every year, at least as many (around thirty) as I could see. It appears that only the *Calendar* of the Church of Greece of the year 1983 makes this exception. This is a mistake, which G. Bekatōros notes and corrects in the *Taxis* of the same year (1983).[356] On pages 8–14, he precisely analyzes the facts of the problem and its correct solution thoroughly. One can see the support for the other position in the *Calendar* of the Church of Greece of the year 1983, pp. 6–8. This topic is summarized as follows:

When holy Pascha, naturally according to the Gregorian Calendar, is celebrated on May 1st or even May 8th, as in 1983, the Sunday, on which the pericope of the gospel of Zacchaeus (and consequently also the epistle of the thirty-second Sunday associated with it) must be read, coincides with the feast of the Holy Hierarchs (January 30). According to the rubrics of the Typikon, when this feast does not coincide with a Sunday of the Triōdion, then the epistle and gospel of the Three Hierarchs is read. The *Calendar* and *Taxis* provide precisely for this for the year 1983. However, the epistle of the thirty-second Sunday and the gospel of Zacchaeus do not reappear on the next Sunday (February 6), but are considered already completed, since in the monasteries, formerly also in the parishes, double readings are read for these pericopes (of the Sunday and of the Saint). Again, according to the rubrics of the Typikon, on the intermediate Sundays from the Sunday of Zacchaeus up until the Sunday of the Publican and the Pharisee (there were three in 1983:

354. Γεννάδιος (Ἀραμπατζόγλου), "Βάσεις καὶ ὁδηγίαι διὰ τὸν καταρτισμὸν τοῦ κανονίου ἑκάστου ἔτους μετὰ σχετικῶν πινάκων," *Ὀρθοδοξία* 13 (1938): 385, 14 (1939): 23.

355. Παγκράτιος (ἐπίσκοπος Λεύκης), "Κανόνες καὶ ὁδηγίαι πρὸς καταρτισμὸν τῶν πασχαλίων πινάκων," *Ὀρθοδοξία* 14 (1939): 314, 338.

356. Γεώργιος Μπεκατῶρος, *Τάξις τῶν Ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθιῶν 1983: κατὰ τὸ Τυπικὸν τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Τύποις Φ. Τσιρώνη, 1983), 8–14.

February 6, 13, and 20), the omitted pericopes from the Sundays of the Gospel of Matthew, with the epistles read together with them, during the current liturgical year—not the astronomical one[357] (in the case in question from Pascha of 1982)—are read, namely, the Fifteenth of Matthew (of the Lawyer) and the fifteenth of the epistles, the Sixteenth of Matthew (of the Talents) and the sixteenth of the epistles, and the Seventeenth of Matthew (of the Canaanite Woman) and seventeenth of the epistles. The new tables of the kanonia also provide for this, which are prescribed in the Apostolikē Diakonia's edition of the Gospel book from the year 1968, pp. 43–50.

The *Calendar* of the Church of Greece implemented this rubric only partially. Namely, it considered the gospel of Zacchaeus as not already done and transferred it to February 6 but considered the epistle of the thirty-second Sunday as having been completed, and provided instead of this, the epistle of the fifteenth Sunday for this Sunday, which, however, is read together with the gospel of the Fifteenth of Matthew (of the Lawyer) and not with the gospel of the Fifteenth of Luke (of Zacchaeus). It would be more consistent if the epistle of the thirty-second Sunday was not viewed as done and was itself also transferred to February 6, so the traditional pairing of the pericopes of Zacchaeus and of the epistle of the thirty-second Sunday would not also be broken up. However, the mistake would then be twofold. Certainly, also in both cases, this is not a mortal sin. The reintroduction of a pericope which has not been read, might even be considered also very natural and consistent with the spirit—not certainly with the letter—of the standard rubrics, inasmuch as—for better or for worse—double pericopes are no longer read in our parish worship.

To this objection, one could respond that spirit and letter both coincide here. The Typikon is not only written for parish temples, but also for monasteries. If an "oikonomia" is applied in the parishes, this must not disturb the taxis of readings also on the subsequent Sundays, namely, to create a greater anomaly. Because, on the

357. The author appears to be contrasting a fixed calendar (an astronomical one) with a moveable one, according to which the beginning of the period of the Triōdion is determined.

Sunday in question, other readings would necessarily be read in the monasteries since the pericope of Zacchaeus and its epistle would be read on January 30 together with the readings of the Hierarchs, and others in the parish temples if they adopt the transfer of these readings to February 6.

However, in this connection, let us note that the tables of the epistles and gospels read together, as well as the guidelines and the kanonia derived from them, are not precise. During the original pairing of the Sunday pericopes, as attested to by the extant Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople (*Codices Timiou Staurou 40* and *Patmos 266* from the tenth century), the gospel pericope of the Fifteenth of Luke (of Zacchaeus, Luke 19:1–10) is not read together with the epistle of the thirty-second Sunday (1 Tim 4:9–15: "the saying is sure…for to this end we toil…"), but with the epistle of the thirty-first Sunday (1 Tim 1:15–17: "the saying is sure…that Christ Jesus came…").[358] Both these pericopes have an internal thematic relationship, for this reason also they were put together. In the gospel, the pious Jews "murmured, saying that He has gone in to be the guest of a man who is a sinner," and Christ declares that "He came… to seek and save the lost" (vv. 7 and 10). In the epistle reading of the thirty-first Sunday, the Apostle Paul assures that Christ "came into the world to save sinners" and that God had mercy on him, the "foremost" among sinners, "for an example to those who were to believe in him [Christ] for eternal life" (vv. 15–16).

This separation of the original pairs of pericopes that were read together and their association with others must be quite old, since it is encountered in manuscripts, antedating the tables and kanonia of Emmanouēl Glyzōnios and Neophytos from Kasos.[359] An exten-

358. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:166–167.

359. Both are credited with the construction of lectionary guidelines in various editions of the Evangelistaria. Emmanouēl Glyzōnios or Glyzounios (Ἐμμανουὴλ Γλυζώνιος or Γλυζούνιος) (1540–1596), born in Chios and resident in Venice, was known as a publisher and editor of liturgical books, including the Psalter (1586), Gospel book (1588), Anthologion (1588), Mēnaia for September and October (1595), and Mēnaia for November (1596), (Χ. Γ. Πατρινέλης, "Γλυζούνιος, Ἐμμανουήλ," *ΘΗΕ* 4:567–568). Neophytos (Νεόφυτος), a hierodeacon of the eighteenth-century resident in Jerusalem, was said to have been from the Aegean Island of Kasos. According

sive discussion regarding this topic will occur in connection with another question. However, it should be noted, only specifically in our case, that the mistake begins from that point where the gospel of the Canaanite Woman is introduced into the series of pericopes of Matthew as a gospel of the Seventeenth Sunday of Matthew and is connected, in the kanonia and tables of associated readings, with the epistle of the seventeenth Sunday ("you are temple of the living God…, 2 Cor 6:16–7:1), which originally was the one read together with the gospel of the First Sunday of Luke. From there and below, all the pairs have been moved by one Sunday: Second of Luke–epistle of the nineteenth Sunday (instead of the eighteenth), Third of Luke–epistle of the twentieth Sunday (instead of the nineteenth), and so forth. The error is corrected towards the end of the series of Luke, when the pericope of the Canaanite Woman is not repeated in the kanonia and in the table, in its original place before the pericope of the Sunday of the Publican and the Pharisee (in the "Gospel books," the pericope of the Canaanite Woman is printed twice, an example itself of the confusion, at the end of Matthew as the Seventeenth Sunday and between the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Sundays of Luke). Thus, the pericope of the epistle of the thirty-second Sunday is connected with the pericope of the Zacchaeus (Fifteenth of Luke) and the gap created is filled.

The epistle of the thirty-second Sunday was originally the epistle reading read together with the pericope of the Canaanite Woman (Matt 15:21–28), an epistle reading with which it is also connected conceptually; according to the epistle reading, Christ is "savior of all humanity" (1 Tim 4:10), namely, not only of the "lost ones of the house of Israel" but of all nations (such as the Canaanite Woman). Thereafter, the pericopes are restored to their old taxis of being read together (Publican and Pharisee–epistle of the thirty-third Sunday, the Prodigal Son–epistle of the thirty-fourth Sunday, and so forth).

---

to an account repeated in various Evangelistaria, the hierodeacon was attributed a major role in a liturgical reform under Patriarch Chrysanthos (Notaras), (Χρύσανθος [Νοταράς]), of Jerusalem (r. 1707–1722) through the publication of kanonia in Evangelistaria for the epistle and gospel readings of the ecclesiastical year.

In a forthcoming answer, we will address the pairs of pericopes and their conceptual relationship. However, while it is not expedient that we repeat ourselves on the theme of the Sunday of the Canaanite Woman, it is useful, even though in a digression, that we complete what we wrote about it above.

It is clear that the normal and original place of the pericope of the Canaanite Woman is at the end of the series of the Sundays of Luke and before the beginning of the Triōdion. Namely, a type of spare pericope, preparatory for the themes of the upcoming period of the Great Lent. According to the ancient rubrics, the gospel of the Canaanite Woman is read at the end of Matthew only when Pascha "arrives within," namely, on March 22nd (with the Old Calendar – the note is not precise from the Gospel book of the Apostolikē Diakonia's standard edition, 1973 and 1982, p. 199, which states that this pericope "is not read in the series of Sundays of the Gospel according to Matthew, other than when Pascha occurs on April 15th"). This case is most rare, since from the fourth up until the twentieth centuries, namely, for 1,700 celebrations of Pascha, Pascha occurred thirteen times on this day. For this reason, also, the Typikon of Saint Sophia from the tenth century and other ancient Kanonaria do not count it as the Seventeenth Sunday of Matthew, but together with its epistle (1 Tim 4:9–15) position it in the series of epistles/gospels[360] as the thirty-second Sunday, namely, between the Sundays of Zacchaeus and that of the Publican and Pharisee.[361] The pericope of the Canaanite Woman has efficacious prayer as a common element with the parable of the Publican and Pharisee, where such prayer is the source for the request of a gentile to be fulfilled and for a sinful Publican to be justified. However, in later manuscripts, it is designated as the Seventeenth of Matthew, a thing that became a later cause for it to be associated with the epistle of the First of Luke (of the seventeenth Sunday, 2 Cor 6:16–7:1), and for the anomaly identified above to be brought about. It is not possible for a pericope, or rather a pair of pericopes (1 Tim 4:9–15 and Matt 15:21–28), which

360. "τὰ ἀποστολοευάγγελα." In this context, the term refers to the sets of associated epistle and gospel readings.

361. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:166–167.

were not read at the end of the Sundays of Matthew, not even once in one hundred years, to be considered found at its original position at this point. Characteristic is the note from a Evangelistarion of the twelfth–thirteenth century, which while placing the pericope of the Canaanite Woman in the position of the Seventeenth Sunday, yet indicates: "it is necessary to know that this gospel of the Canaanite Woman, on account of Pascha often coming to occur outside,[362] thus has no room to be read on the Saturdays and Sundays of Matthew, because seventeen Sundays were never recognized; but it is read in Luke, on the Sunday before the Pharisee, if indeed Luke is lacking, so to speak, on account of Pascha being prolonged" (*Codex Princeton New Jersey*).

## 431

**On some feasts, two epistle and gospel pericopes are prescribed (September 1, 2, October 26, and others). Must two pericopes also be read?**

Nowadays, as it is well known, no more than one set of readings are read in parishes. The older practice was different. They read double epistles and double gospels of the series (of the day) and of the saint being celebrated, as is done also nowadays in the monasteries of the Holy Mountain. However, the practice of parish temples immediately interests us because this is relevant to the great majority of the Church and because these problems present themselves in the Church after the prevalence of the taxis that is prescribed by the modern Typika, namely, reading one set of readings. In another answer, we saw that an excessive preference of the epistle readings (but in part also of the gospel readings) of saints to the daily ones chiefly led to the same readings being repeated ad nauseam. In the answer to question 421, we insisted on this point. With this new opportunity, let it be permitted for us to insist on another equally serious part of this question, which we also posed at that time, on the unacceptable and antitraditional omission of the sequentially

362. "διὰ τὸ πολλάκις συμβαίνειν γίνεσθαι τὸ Πάσχα ἔξω." In other words, "outside" here means that Pascha occurs on a date beyond March 22 on the Julian Calendar.

read pericopes. If we generalize the significance of a saint "being celebrated" and accept as a basic guide the second part of the Apostolos and Gospel book (in the establishment of tables of associated readings for the year), namely, the "Mēnologion," essentially, we are moving towards the abolition of the first and main part of the books of the pericopes, which prescribe the sequential reading of the holy Scriptures.[363] And to stay with the Apostolos, where the problem is more acute, there are months that are almost entirely covered by the pericopes of the Mēnologion. For example, November has epistle readings for twenty-eight days, January for twenty-six, October for twenty-five, December for twenty-three, September for twenty-two, July for twenty-one, and so forth. If all the saints of these days were considered as "celebrated," is it an exaggeration for us to say that the sequential reading of holy Scripture is being destroyed or almost abolished?

In order to connect the points above with the present question, we repeat that the significance of the listing of the pericopes in the Mēnologion is optional and not obligatory for liturgical practice. Namely, the pericopes of the saints are read only when the saints are celebrated, either generally, the great saints, or locally. Otherwise, the pericopes of the first part of the Apostolos and the Gospel book, namely, of the days of the week, have the most priority. With the same criterion, we must deal with double pericopes, wherever they exist. And there are quite a few. In the Apostolos, September 1 (Indiction, Symeōn the Stylite), September 2 (Mamas, Iōannēs the Faster), September 3 (Anthimos, Theoktistos), September 24 (Myrtidiōtissa, Thekla), October 20 (Artemios, Gerasimos), October 22 (Aberkios, Seven Youths), November 9 (Onēsiphoros, Nektarios), December 17 (Daniēl the prophet, Dionysios of Aegina), June 14 (Elissaios, Methodios), and July 26 (Hermolaos, Paraskevē). In the Gospel book, September 1 (Indiction, Symeōn), September 2 (Mamas, Iōannēs the Faster), October 26 (Dēmētrios, earthquake), December 17 (Daniēl, Dionysios), January 4 (Forefeast of the feast of Lights, Seventy Apostles), January 10 (Afterfeast of the Feast of

363. Phountoulēs discusses aspects of the festive taxis for celebrated saints in questions 131, 154, 173, 174, 341, 342, 343, 369, 421, 560, and 595.

Lights, Grēgorios of Nyssa), January 11 (Afterfeast of the feast of Lights, Theodosios the Koinobiarchēs), and May 8 (John the Theologian, Arsenios).

Generally, in these cases of double pericopes, the pericope of the saint should be preferred where he/she is actually celebrated. If two are both equally celebrated, the epistle of the one and the gospel of the other could be read. Moreover, this is not consistent with the purpose for which these selections were made. The reading of double pericopes, outside of the fact that this is no longer customary, would lead to a new opposite excess, namely, to the unbounded and uncritical multiplication of readings. There are instances of ancient manuscripts where they do not only record two pericopes, like those of our contemporary printed liturgical books, which we noted above, but even more. Still, other manuscripts mention other pericopes for other saints, precisely for the pertinent choice to be appropriate depending on the saint, where according to time and place they were celebrated. Moreover, the essential benefit, in a case of reading double pericopes for the saints being celebrated, would be small, since the pericopes of the sequential readings would not be read, but those of the saints of the Mēnologion, where the same readings are repeated continuously.

And to turn again to the authority of the Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople from the tenth century, of the codices of *Timiou Staurou 40* and *Patmos 266*, in order to find certain typical examples: On September 1 in the Great Church, they said an epistle for Blessed Symeōn the Stylite (Col 3:12–16) and a gospel for the Indiction (Luke 4:16–22a), while in the temple of the Theotokos Chalkoprateia, a different epistle for the Blessed one (Gal 5:22–6:2) and a gospel for the Theotokos (Luke 1:39–56).[364] On October 26, in the martyrium of Saint Dēmētrios "in the quarter of Deuteron,"[365] they said the epistle and gospel of the Saint (2 Tim

364. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:8–9.

365. "τῷ ὄντι ἐν τῷ Δευτέρῳ." The Deuteron (τὸ Δεύτερον) was a military quarter of Constantinople to the rear of the second military gate, "where Gothic soldiers had their barracks," Stephen Turnbull and Peter Dennis, *The Walls of Constantinople*, Fortress [Book 25] (Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2004), 22.

2:1–10, John 15:17–16:3), while in the temple of the Theotokos of Blachernai, the epistle and gospel of the earthquake[366] (Heb 12:6–10, Luke 8:22–25).[367] On January 1, while the Evangelistaria have two pericopes, one for the Circumcision (Luke 2:20–21, 40–52) and one for Basileios the Great (John 10:9–16), at Saint Sophia only one was read, the gospel for the Circumcision of Christ.[368]

If we also treat our liturgical book's double pericopes in particular instances with the same broad spirit that we see similar instances being treated in the Typikon of Saint Sophia, our problem is easily solved. In the case of the Indiction and of Blessed Symeōn, with the reading of the epistle of the Blessed one and the gospel of the Indiction. On October 26, May 8, and July 26, the readings for Saint Dēmētrios, John the Theologian, and Saint Paraskevē, who are universally celebrated, take precedence. In nearly all other cases, I think that it is necessary for the readings of the day from the sequential readings to be preferred, except if a certain saint is especially celebrated, the temple has its feast day, or in any circumstance the synaxis takes place in his/her honor. Fr. Kōnstantinos Papagiannēs has made relevant proposals in his study, "The Holy Scripture in Worship," published by the periodical, *Grēgorios ho Palamas*, Thessaloniki, 1966, p. 9.[369]

366. For a discussion of earthquakes and their effects on the Typikon, see Brian Croke, "Two Early Byzantine Earthquakes and their Liturgical Commemoration," *Byzantion* 51 (1981): 122–147; Mark Roosien, "The Liturgical Commemoration of Earthquakes in Late Antique Constantinople: At the Intersection of Ritual, Environment, and Empire" (PhD diss., The University of Notre Dame, 2018); Antti Arjava, "The Mystery Cloud of 536 CE in the Mediterranean Sources," *DOP* 59 (2005): 73–94; Glanville Downey, "Earthquakes at Constantinople and Vicinity, A.D. 342–1454," *Speculum* 30 (1955): 596–600; and Emanuela Guidoboni, *Catalogue of ancient earthquakes in the Mediterranean area up to the 10th century* (Bologna: Istituto Nationale di Geofisica, 1994).

367. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:78–81.

368. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:170–171.

369. Κωνσταντῖνος Παπαγιάννης, "Ἡ ἁγία Γραφὴ ἐν τῇ λατρείᾳ," *Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς* 49 (1966): 9. Kōnstantinos Papagiannēs (1929–2014).

## 432

**From personal experience and from what we occasionally read, as well as from discrepancies of the Calendar regarding the determination of the Sunday readings, we have the impression that there exists a general irregularity in the system of readings in use. How does this system function and where does its complex form come from, which also causes errors in its implementation?**

The topic of the epistle and gospel readings in the Divine Liturgy is indeed difficult and complex. We already discussed it in pertinent preceding answers, and its scale and difficulties became clear from the entire treatment of topics concerning the pericopes up until now. The above question gives us the opportunity for a more general and full consideration of the topic. Needless for us to say, that here the topic is neither exhausted nor its specific and general problems also resolved. However, I hope that what will be written will make matters less obscure and more understandable. Perhaps also this will increase awareness of the need for its systematic study, which is not a work of one, but of many expert scientific scholars and committees on a Pan-Orthodox basis. This is because this topic does not concern and cannot just be limited to the Greek church but extends also to the tradition of the Slavic churches, as we shall see in the answer that follows. Thus, the entire question will be clarified with the aim that any mistakes will be corrected, and the practice of the local Orthodox churches will be harmonized on whatever points it differs.

We will restrict ourselves below only to the Sunday epistles and gospels of the liturgical year. Only exceptionally will we refer to pericopes of the weekdays, and this because the Sunday pericopes have particular importance, and they alone are sufficient to give us a good comprehensive image of our topic. The system of weekday pericopes, largely independent from the system of Sunday pericopes, has special problems, which are not presently being examined. In addition, in the present answer, we will limit ourselves only to the Greek tradition. In a following question and answer, we will summarize the Slavic tradition and, comparing it with the Greek, will attempt to explain their differences. Thus, within the framework

and capabilities of these answers, I hope that we will provide a perspective as complete and useful as possible.

In the answer to question 179 concerning the Sunday gospels of Luke, we saw how deep the system of readings has its roots in our ecclesiastical tradition, even if many times the reasons elude us for which the choice, sequence, or transfer of various pericopes took place. Here also for many centuries, perhaps already from the fourth century, this system was in use in Constantinople and in the churches that followed its taxis, even if the final development of this system, with the various changes and modifications that gradually occurred, took place later. The history of its development has not been sufficiently studied, although it is exceptionally interesting and especially useful practically. It is also not easy. The manuscripts are numerous, and the comparative study of the various traditions, influences, and re-orderings requires effort and much attention. In order that we give an impression of the size of this effort, let us note that in 1900 C.R. Gregory, in his book, *Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (in German),[370] had noted 1,072 Gospel manuscripts (Evangelistaria) and 1,077 Apostoloi, written from the tenth up until the seventeenth centuries. This number has significantly risen from the subsequent research of modern scholars.

Through fortunate circumstances, the Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople is preserved in two manuscripts from the tenth century (*Timiou Staurou 40* and *Patmos 266*), a text of exceptional importance which has been published in an excellent manner and annotated by the professor J. Mateos (*The Typikon of the Great Church*, in French, volumes 1 and 2, Rome 1962 and 1963).[371] This Typikon is a singular guide to our topic because naturally the sequence of pericopes of epistles and gospels for the entire year is shown in it and pertinent directions are given for their cycle. The Typikon of the Great Church of Saint Sophia was the basis for the standard Typikon

370. Caspar René Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1900–1909).

371. Juan Mateos, ed. and trans., *Le Typicon de la Grande Église. Ms. Sainte-Croixe no. 40, Xe siècle. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes*, OCA 165–166 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1962–1963).

and, because of its nature, the most accurate and the most official. Hereinafter we will call it "Typikon of Saint Sophia" in order to distinguish it from the one later in use, "Typikon of the Great Church" (Kōnstantinos–Violakēs).[372]

In the Typikon of Saint Sophia, the system of pericopes, their division and cycle are as precisely captured as in our contemporary liturgical books, the Apostolos and the Gospel book. There are differences only in details of small significance, which are easily explained. This system of pericopes of the Typikon of Saint Sophia, which is almost contemporary with the spread of Christian faith and worship to the Slavic world, is the first, as far as I know, authentic encapsulation of the tradition of the Church of Constantinople, common nowadays to all the Orthodox churches of the ecumene. It must also constitute the guide, or at least the main guide together with the manuscript Gospels, Praxapostoloi, and various Typika, for the rectification of any corruptions or mistakes in present-day practice. And in order for us to be able to find the correct one, we must precisely here acknowledge that from theory to practice and from the original system to its implementation in everyday practice, quite a few mistakes and misunderstandings took place, which corrupted the original unity and led largely to the present-day disorder.

The system of the cycle of readings, which we will see, is quite simple (that is, as simple as possible), but the understanding of its defined key principles is necessary for its correct implementation in practice. We must also recognize that this implementation of a simple theory and complex practice is not an easy matter and neither does it take place humanly without error. If we take under consideration that:

- Pascha and all the Sundays and weeks of the year are progressing through the calendar,
- the preceding year does not coincide with the current one and with the one following in relation to the day of Pascha,

372. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874); Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921).

- many Sunday readings are traditionally moveable in the cycle of the pericopes,
- the fixed calendar feasts influenced the readings, and, finally,
- the change of the calendar brought about new disruptions to the Heortologion,

we understand how many complex problems which that person had to face, who from good intentions and, albeit with great knowledge and attention, attempted this harmonization. But occasionally it had to be done by someone, as was done with the paschalia.[373] It would be easy, but also not practical, to give general guidelines and a system of pericopes to priests, and especially to readers and chanters, and that they should be in charge and have the responsibility for its[374] implementation in practice. One can imagine what mistakes would be made, if indeed one happened to know the practice before the general circulation to our villages of the *Calendar-Typikon of the Church of Greece*.

Two men chiefly undertook this work, Emmanouēl Glyzōnios (or Glynzōnios or Glyzounios) from Chios,[375] scholarly editor and publisher of liturgical books, and the deacon Neophytos from Kasos,[376] Prōtothyrōros of the Great Church.[377] In 1587, the former published the "Evangelistarion," in an appendix of the publication of the Gospel book, with guidelines and thirty-five "kanonia" based on an equal number of possibilities for the celebration of Pascha, from March 22 up until April 25 (according to the Julian Calendar). As applicable, he groups together all the Sundays of the year with their dates, the eōthinon gospel, the tone, and the gospel reading of the

373. paschalion (pl., paschalia). πασχάλιον, τό (pl., πασχάλια, τά). This term can designate both the dating computations for Pascha as well as the resulting tables that list the yearly dates for Pascha and often also the dependent cycle of moveable feasts and holy days.

374. The system of pericopes.

375. Ἐμμανουὴλ Γλυζώνιος (ἢ Γλυνζώνιος ἢ Γλυζούνιος).

376. Νεόφυτος ὁ ἐκ Κάσου.

377. The office of "ὁ πρωτοθυρωρός," "first doorkeeper," involved liturgical duties, and a clergyman was usually appointed, see Jean Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ΟΦΦΙΚΙΑ de l'église byzantine*, Archives de L'Orient Chrétien 11 (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1970), 283.

Liturgy. In a special table, he put the gospels and the epistles, which "ought to accompany the gospels,"[378] in two columns. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the deacon Neophytos attempted to remedy the mistakes and omissions of Glyzōnios's Evangelistarion, who apart from other things also added the beginnings of the epistle pericopes to the kanonia. Thus, at the end of the Church's large Gospel books up until nowadays, tables and guidelines (in modern editions, with an addendum of kanonia until May 8 for the celebration of Pascha according to the Gregorian Calendar) are published that at least are to be supposedly used by priests and to assist them at any time for finding the readings. Unfortunately, these kanonia were erroneous. In spite of this, they constituted the basis for the determination of the reading of the pericopes up until today. And as so long as the matter remained unnoticed, it was somehow excusable. However, the bad thing is that even after the highlighting of the errors of these kanonia, their publication in the Gospel books continued, and based on them, the Apostoloi are also published and the standard rubrics of the Kyriakodromion[379] are written. Thus, the errors come close to being elevated to sacred tradition, Glyzōnios and Neophytos to being considered Fathers of the Church, and their mistakes to being a credit to them. Thirty years ago, the oikonomos and hierarchical vicar of Skiathos of blessed memory, Geōrgios Rēgas, in *Questions of the Typikon* (Athens 1954, pp. 51–60),[380] pointed out the mistaken rubrics of the kanonia and of the modern Typikon. Almost at the same time, Geōrgios Bekatōros in his two in-depth and

378. "τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις ἕπεσθαι ὀφείλουσι."

379. "κυριακοδρόμιον, τό" (pl. κυριακοδρόμια, τά). kyriakodromion (pl. kyriakodromia). This term can designate a book containing the cycle of gospel and epistle readings for Sundays and pertinent homilies, or the cycle of the Sunday gospel and epistle readings in general.

380. Γεώργιος Ρήγας, *Ζητήματα Τυπικοῦ* (Ἀθῆναι: Συνοδινός, 1954), 51–60. Georgios Regas (1884–1961), a native of Skiathos, studied there and in Athens, was ordained in 1920, exercised pastoral and teaching responsibilities, and was eventually honored with the ecclesiastical office of oikonomos. His scholarship included special studies focused on the liturgical life of Skiathos and extensive works dealing with the Typikon. See the discussion of Phountoulēs in the introduction of Γεώργιος Ρήγας, ed., *Τυπικόν*, Λειτουργικὰ Βλατάδων 1 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 1994), 7–10.

most profound introductions to the *Taxis of the Sacred Services* for the years 1956 and 1957 (pp. 3–11 and 5–13, respectively) analyzes the history and the errors of these kanonia and proposes the necessary corrections.[381] And most significantly, he made his completed work available to the competent authorities for the purpose of correcting the erroneous texts. Certainly, this presupposes a revision of the printed editions, which while easier for the Evangelistarion (an omission or revision of Glyzōnios's "kanonia"), is more difficult for the Apostolos, as we shall now see. It certainly also requires a more accurate study and comparison with the manuscript Evangelistaria in order for older errors also to be corrected. These corrections can and must be done. These are proven mistakes, which disturb the taxis of the readings and disrupt the unity of liturgical practice.

We are not going to go into details. This is neither useful at the present time, nor fits into the framework of these *Answers*. We will just outline a few general points, from which the relative simplicity, as we said, will be shown of the system of readings and their cycle on its governing principles, and its erroneous implementation in practice, according to older errors and according to the kanonia of Glyzōnios and Neophytos.

1. The system of readings of the epistles and gospels are structured according to weeks. Each week, without any exception, begins from Monday and ends on Sunday. Namely, what we clearly see occur in all of the weeks of the three evangelists (Matthew, Luke, and Mark) and in the corresponding weeks of the epistles, is applicable also for John and the Acts (Pentēkostarion). And there, the first week is Renewal Week, and the first Sunday is the Sunday of Antipascha (of Thomas); the second week is the week after the Sunday of Thomas and the second Sunday is the Sunday of the Myrrhbearers; and so forth. The Sunday of Pascha is without a number. In the Apostolos and in the Gospel book, the weeks are correctly numbered, but not the Sundays, since the Sunday of the Myrrhbearers is described as

381. Γεώργιος Μπεκατῶρος, *Τάξις τῶν Ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθιῶν 1956: κατὰ τὸ Τυπικὸν τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1956), 3–11; and *Τάξις τῶν Ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθιῶν 1957: κατὰ τὸ Τυπικὸν τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1957), 5–13.

the third Sunday, the Sunday of the Paralytic as the fourth, and so forth. This error is encountered even in the manuscripts, and the Gospel book notes it, but neither does it nor the Apostolos correct this, and thus the first confusion is created: "Note that in the combined reading of both the gospels and epistles of the weeks of the year, the first Sunday begins from the Sunday of the Antipascha, but in the kanonia, the Holy and Great Sunday of Pascha is called first, the Sunday of the Antipascha is called second, and thus subsequently the remaining Sundays up until Pentecost" (*Gospel*, third edition, K. Antōniadēs, in Athens 1905, p. 254).[382]

Thus, the Sunday of Pascha is wrongly described as the first Sunday of John and the first of the Acts. The first Sunday both in the case of the cycle of readings and in all the other cases, as we shall see, is the Sunday of Thomas, that of the Antipascha, the so-called "Κυριακὴ τῶν Ἐγκαινίων" (Sunday of Inauguration), "Νέα" (New) or "Καινὴ Κυριακή" (New Sunday). When explaining this, Saint Grēgorios the Theologian differentiates it from the Sunday of Pascha, while at the same time assigning its governing first position in the system of Sundays: "Therefore, what will someone say? Was not the first Sunday, the one after the holy night and the torchlight, the one of inauguration (τὸ ἐγκαίνιον), but are you confusing this one with the present day, O you who is fond of feasts?[383] ...That one[384] was salvation, but this one was the celebration of the birth of salvation (τὸ τῆς σωτηρίας γενέθλιον); and while that one was the border between the tomb and the Resurrection, this one is purely of the second birth; in order that just as the first creation began from Sunday...so also the second creation begins anew from the same day, which is those days' first day and the eighth day of those before, a day more sublime than the sublime and more wondrous than the wondrous. For it brings us to the state above" (*Oration 44, On the New Day*, 5).[385]

---

382. *Θεῖον καὶ ἱερὸν Εὐαγγέλιον* (Ἀθῆναι: K. Αντωνιάδης, 1905), 254.

383. "φιλέορτε." Compare, "Προσέλθωμεν λαμπαδηφόροι, τῷ προϊόντι Χριστῷ ἐκ τοῦ μνήματος, ὡς νυμφίῳ, καὶ συνεορτάσωμεν, ταῖς φιλεόρτοις τάξεσι, Πάσχα Θεοῦ τό σωτήριον" in the canon of Pascha.

384. Pascha.

385. PG 36:612c–613a. Compare the translation in Martha Vinson, ed. and trans., *St. Gregory of Nazianzus, Select Orations*, vol. 107 of The Fathers of

In the synaxarion of the Pentēkostarion, Nikēphoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos[386] analyzes this point more clearly: "Therefore, on the one hand, inauguration had become an ancient custom for something of significance; for when the year came around and landed on the same day, on which at that time it was brought about, they made an annual commemoration of that event in order that the greatest of works might not be forgotten... Therefore, since of all things in life the Resurrection of the Lord especially is the greatest work and beyond all understanding, not only do we celebrate and inaugurate it every year, but also always upon eight days later. Accordingly, the present Sunday is a first inauguration, namely, it would be chiefly called both eighth and first; eighth as from Pascha, but first as the beginning of the others.[387] And again eighth, because it is appointed in the image of that infinite day of the one in the future age, which shall in all ways be both a first and a single day, uninterrupted by night." The first troparion of the seventh ode of the canon of the Sunday of Thomas, a poem of Saint Iōannēs of Damascus, also repeats the same thing: "Since it is the first* and mistress of days* this radiant day,* therein it is meet that rejoicing are* the new and divine people* for in trembling it bears* also the representation of eternity,* as the eighth day completing the future...."[388]

It is certainly well known that nowadays the reading of the Gospel according to John and the Acts begins during the Liturgy of the Sunday of Pascha. Perhaps this can be justified by the fact that their introductions (their "beginning") are read at that time. Per-

---

the Church (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2003), 230–238.

386. Nikēphoros Xanthopoulos (d. ca. 1335) was a priest of Saint Sophia and made significant contributions to hymnology, the interpretation of liturgical texts, as well as the composition of prayers and synaxaria, and wrote a church history, the surviving text of which extends to the seventh century, see Hans-Georg Beck, *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959), 705.

387. The "others" are the Sundays of the year.

388. "Ὡς πρώτη ὑπάρχει* ἡμερῶν καὶ κυρία* ἡ λαμπρφόρος αὕτη,* ἐν ᾗ ἀγάλλεσθαι ἄξιον* τὸν καινὸν καὶ θεῖον λαόν·* ἐν τρόμῳ φέρει γάρ* καὶ αἰῶνος τὸν τύπον,* ὡς ὀγδοὰς τελοῦσα τοῦ μέλλοντος...." See also question 532 where Phountoulēs also discusses the Sunday of the Antipascha.

haps because the main Paschal Liturgy was originally the Liturgy of Basileios the Great of the Vespers of Great Saturday, namely, the all-night vigil of Pascha, during which the end of the Gospel according to Matthew is read. The fact that on the Tuesday of Renewal Week a pericope from the Gospel according to Luke (24:12–35) is provided instead of one from the Gospel according to John (as would be natural) can be considered as a trace of the transference of the pericopes. The complete reading of the introductions of the Acts and of John during the Liturgy of Pascha is in any case the reason that prompted the change of the numbering in the Sundays of John and of the Acts.

Our suspicions that the Gospel according to John did not begin on the Sunday of Pascha is verified by the Jerusalemite Kanonarion from the seventh century, which is preserved in a Georgian translation. Indeed, according to the Kanonarion, the introduction of the Gospel according to John (1:1–17) was read during the Divine Liturgy "on the first holy Sunday of Pentecost, which is the New Sunday,"[389] namely, on the Sunday of Thomas. The pericope that narrates the appearance to the eleven, and to Thomas (John 20:26–31), was read, according to the Kanonarion above, in the Vespers of this Sunday "at the ninth hour," as takes place nowadays during the Vespers of the day of Pascha with the pericope of the first appearance of the Risen One to the ten disciples (John 20:19–25). Perhaps the beginning of the Gospel according to John was drawn to the Liturgy of Pascha by the beginning of the Acts, which is read on that day, not because the reading of the Acts begins then, but due to its resurrectional content.

After the Sundays and the weeks of John, the period of Matthew begins from the Monday of the Holy Spirit. Luke follows from the Monday after the Sunday of the Exaltation or from the Monday after the "new year, which is the equinox" (September 23), according to the more ancient rubrics. Mark comes after, mainly during Lent. Two Sundays are inserted between Matthew and Luke (before and after the Exaltation) or three, when the Exaltation falls on a Sunday. Four Sundays are inserted around the end of Luke (before and after

389. "τῇ πρώτῃ ἁγίᾳ Κυριακῇ τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς, ἥτις ἐστὶ Νέα Κυριακή."

the Nativity of Christ, before and after the feast of Lights), even if the Nativity or the feast of Lights falls on a Sunday. Depending on the lateness of Pascha, the Sundays of Matthew are decreased and the Sundays between the Sunday after the feast of Lights and the Triōdion are increased (especially after the implementation of the Gregorian Calendar). The opposite takes place when Pascha is early. There are relevant guidelines in the Typika—which are not always correctly implemented—for how this adjustment of the Sunday pericopes is done. The pericope is considered completed when the epistle or the gospel of the feast or of the saint of the day is read because two pericopes were read both in the monasteries and formerly also in the parishes. Namely, the taxis of the cycle of the weeks or of the Sundays is not disturbed. In a similar way when, for the reasons that we saw in answer number 179, the Sunday pericope alone is transferred, and the pericopes of the week are not moved. However, conversely, the pericopes of the Sundays before and after the Exaltation, before and after the Nativity of Christ, and before and after the feast of Lights do not complete the Sunday pericopes that would happen to be read on these days. However, in the practice of the Slavic churches, the pericopes of the Sundays before and after the Exaltation are read together with the pericopes of the sequence of Matthew. However, we will address this in another answer.[390]

In the answer to question 430, we spoke regarding the pericope of the Canaanite Woman and the anomalies that its characterization as the Seventeenth Sunday of Matthew brought about.

2. Much the same things are in force with regard to epistle pericopes. These also begin with the Acts of the Apostles from Renewal Week with the Sunday of Thomas as the first Sunday—but which is numbered as the second—and continue up until the Sunday of Pentecost. From the Monday of the Holy Spirit, the epistles of Paul begin, which are numbered sequentially in the Apostolos up until the Saturday of the thirty-fifth week (Week of the Prodigal Son) and continue up until the end of Lent (Fifth Sunday of the Fast).

390. See question 523.

As also in the gospels, we have another grouping from the Saturday of Lazarus and Palm Sunday up until the Vespers of Great Saturday.

The weeks also here begin from Monday and end on Sunday. When a pericope for whatever reason is not read in its sequence, as also in the case of the gospels, it is considered completed because it is supposed that it was read together with the pericope of the saint, according to the ancient system. The fluctuations in the number of weeks between Matthew and the Sunday before the Exaltation and between the Sunday after the feast of Lights and that of the Triōdion, also influence, as is natural, the weeks of the epistles and they follow along the transfers of the Sunday gospels, but not contrary to the pairings that the "kanonia" prescribe.

3. Each epistle reading is connected with a specific gospel reading, namely, they constitute a pair. As on feasts and commemorations of saints, on Sundays before and after the Exaltation, before and after the Nativity, and before and after the feast of Lights, we have a pair of pericopes prescribed for each instance, thus also throughout the entire liturgical year the epistles and gospels move in pairs. Namely, what is done nowadays during the period of the Triōdion and Pentēkostarion and during the weeks of Matthew, is in force for the entire cycle of pericopes. An exception occurs nowadays in the cases of the transferred Sundays of Luke, during which the gospel pericope of the Sunday alone is transferred without its epistle following. However, I think that this is a mistake, which is due to the erroneous connection of the epistle pericopes with the tones and eōthina gospels, as we will see below, and not with the gospel pericopes, as it should.

It is not easy for us to verify why now certain epistle pericopes have been connected with certain gospels, namely, whether there exists some clear or less apparent reason that constituted a criterion for this pairing. In any case, we must acknowledge that in the sequential reading of the epistles and gospels, the ones who constructed the systems of pericopes had to face serious difficulties if they indeed sought to achieve some thematic or other unity between the pericopes read together. Their selection must occur from texts that follow a sequence prescribed in advance. From the trans-

fers of chapters and the choices that take place, at least regarding the pericopes of Saturdays and Sundays, we can verify that they tried and also partially succeeded where possible. For example, on the Sunday of the Paralytic, an epistle and gospel give an account of the healing of paralytics.[391] The Second of Matthew and the second of the epistles speak regarding the preaching of the gospel,[392] the Fourteenth of Matthew and the fourteenth of the epistles regarding betrothals and marriages.[393] In the answer to question 430, we confirm a similar conceptual relationship between the gospel reading of Zacchaeus and the epistle of the thirty-first Sunday and between the pericope of the Canaanite Woman and the epistle of the thirty-second Sunday, which were read together according to the ancient correct taxis. In these original pairings of the pericopes of the Sundays of Luke and their epistles, we note many parallels. In the calling of the apostles of the First of Luke,[394] the epistle of seventeenth Sunday[395] fits in with the exhortation of Paul to the faithful, "come out from them and be separate…" (2 Cor 6:17). With the gospel of the Second of Luke,[396] which speaks concerning doing good and lending, the epistle of the eighteenth Sunday,[397] which highlights "a cheerful giver" who "scattered, gave to the poor" (2 Cor 9:7–10). The gospel of the Seventh of Luke[398] regarding the faith of the woman with a flow of blood and the resurrection of the daughter of Jairus and the epistle (twenty-third Sunday)[399] concerning the salvation of dead humanity by faith and cooperation through Christ. The Eighth of Luke[400] regarding the good Samaritan—is alongside also its epistle (twenty-fourth Sunday)[401] regarding Christ who has broken down the dividing wall

391. John 5:1–15; Acts 9:32–41.
392. Matt 4:18–23; Rom 2:10–16.
393. Matt 22:2–14; 2 Cor 1:21–2:4.
394. Luke 5:1–11.
395. 2 Cor 6:16–7:1.
396. Luke 6:31–36.
397. 2 Cor 9:6–11.
398. Luke 8:41–56.
399. Eph 2:4–10.
400. Luke 10:25–37.
401. Eph 2:14–22.

and brought peace to humanity. The Tenth of Luke[402] regarding the raising of the woman bent double[403] and the epistle (twenty-sixth Sunday)[404] concerning the spiritual raising of the faithful. The Twelfth of Luke[405] regarding the grateful leper and its epistle (twenty-eighth Sunday)[406] concerning thanks due to God. The pericope of the Sunday of the Prodigal Son[407] regarding the youth who fled "the life with prostitutes," and its epistle concerning the avoidance of fornication.[408] On the Sunday of Cheesefare, both pericopes speak regarding fasting.[409] All these things cannot be random.

But no matter what the internal relationship is between the pairs of epistle and gospel pericopes, one thing is certain, that the pericopes are in twos, being read together in a pair for centuries according to the Church's tradition. These pairs appear scattered in the kanonia, which from the last Sundays of Matthew, and beyond, are mostly erroneous. Of the thirty-five, only seven connect the First of Luke with the seventeenth Sunday of the epistles ("...you are a temple of the living God..."),[410] with which it is always associated. We set forth below a table of associated readings according to the Typikon of Saint Sophia, from the eleventh Sunday of Matthew up until the Sunday of the Prodigal Son, namely, the period of great irregularity:

402. Luke 12:16–21.
403. "τῆς συγκυπτούσης." (BDAG, s.v. "συγκύπτω").
404. Eph 5:8–19.
405. Luke 17:12–19.
406. Col 1:12–18.
407. Luke 15:11–32.
408. The thirty-fourth Sunday, 1 Cor 6:12–20.
409. Matt 25:31–46; Romans 13:11–14:4.
410. 2 Cor 6:16.

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11th | Matthew | — 11th | epistle | 7th | Luke | — 23rd | epistle |
| 12th | Matthew | — 12th | epistle | 8th | Luke | — 24th | epistle |
| 13th | Matthew | — 13th | epistle | 9th | Luke | — 25th | epistle |
| 14th | Matthew | — 14th | epistle | 10th | Luke | — 26th | epistle |
| 15th | Matthew | — 15th | epistle | 11th | Luke | — 27th | epistle |
| 16th | Matthew | — 16th | epistle | 12th | Luke | — 28th | epistle |
| 1st | Luke | — 17th | epistle | 13th | Luke | — 29th | epistle |
| 2nd | Luke | — 18th | epistle | 14th | Luke | — 30th | epistle |
| 3rd | Luke | — 19th | epistle | 15th | Luke | — 31st | epistle |
| 4th | Luke | — 20th | epistle | Canaanite Woman | | — 32nd | epistle |
| 5th | Luke | — 21st | epistle | Publican–Pharisee | | — 33rd | epistle |
| 6th | Luke | — 22nd | epistle | Prodigal Son | | — 34th | epistle |

This breakup of these original pairs is due to an older as well as to a modern mistake. The older one, which is also encountered in manuscripts, was the insertion of the Sunday of the Canaanite Woman at the end of the pericopes of Matthew, its characterization as the Seventeenth Sunday, and its connection with the epistle of the seventeenth Sunday and not the thirty-second. The modern error is due to the kanonia, which connected a tone, eōthinon gospel, and epistle pericope, and, thus, epistle and gospel readings were disconnected.

4. The system of the cycle of the eight tones, namely, of eight weeks, begins from the Sunday of Thomas and cycles over again throughout the entire year up until the Friday of the Sixth Week of the Fast, namely, the end of Great Lent. The days from the Saturday of Lazarus up until the Saturday of Renewal Week are also found during this time outside of the cycle. The peculiarity of the system of the cycle of tones in comparison with the system of pericopes amounts to the fact that it begins from Sunday and ends on Saturday. Obviously, it follows another tradition concerning the beginning and end of weekly time, the Judaic one. Apart from this, it navigates through the liturgical year similar to the readings, but without any interruption or transfer. When a Sunday or a week is taken over by a feast of the Lord, the tone is considered completed whether chanted together or not, and afterwards the cycle

continues normally as if it had not been interrupted. The Pentēkostarion is also subject to this cycle, during which from the New Sunday (of Thomas) up until the Sunday of All Saints the sequence of tones is completed. Even in the First Sunday (of Thomas) and its week, and in Pentecost and its week, for which the first and the grave tones respectively are designated, their presence is manifest, even if the troparia of the Paraklētikē "are absent."[411] Pascha and Renewal Week, here as one day, lie outside numbering and outside the sequence of tones.

What relationship do the tones have with the readings? None. This must be absolutely understood. This is a second cycle, later in time, and independent of the cycle of readings and nowhere intersecting with it. The editors of the kanonia did not understand this and, for this reason, they created a new complication. And this is why.

For every Sunday, each tone has two resurrectional prokeimena and an allēlouarion. The first prokeimenon is intended for the eōthinon gospel, the second for the epistle, and the allēlouarion for the gospel of the Divine Liturgy. These three elements are "resurrectional,"[412] as they are characterized by the Typikon of Saint Sophia. Namely, the psalms, from which they are derived, either are explained by the Fathers as referring prophetically to the Resurrection, or their titles have the description, "for the eighth day"[413] or "on the day of the Sabbath,"[414] or, in any event, are joyous and festive. They belong to the Oktōēchos and do not have any relation to the system of the cycle of pericopes. In the Apostoloi and in the Typika, they are determined beforehand and are placed in special tables, as also the prokeimena and allēlouaria of the weekdays, in order that they may be conveniently used. Their determination ahead of time is easy in the periods of John and Matthew, because by chance they correspond with the sequence of the Kyriakodromion. From there and beyond, they depend on the course of the tones, and not that of the

411. "σχολάζουν."
412. "ἀναστάσιμα."
413. "ὑπὲρ τῆς ὀγδόης."
414. "εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ Σαββάτου."

epistles, as occurs in the kanonia and in the Apostoloi, which results in the creation of many errors.

5. Finally, the Sunday eōthina gospels constitute a third cycle. They also themselves begin from the first Sunday, the Sunday of Thomas, and after the pattern of the cycle of the tones move through the year up until the Fifth Sunday of the Fast. They are completely free and independent from the cycle of the epistles/gospels and from the cycle of the tones, also consequently from their eight resurrectional prokeimena, and much more from the eight resurrectional prokeimena of the epistles and the epistle pericopes.[415] The tones are eight, the eōthina gospels eleven. Consequently, the period of their cycle does not coincide with the period of the tones, and where they coincide, it is a coincidence. They only have a common beginning, as do the tones and pericopes, the Sunday of Thomas. Their transfers, which take place during the period of the Pentēkostarion, are due to other reasons, to the attempt that they are all read during this period and to "an eōthinon gospel setting forth or giving an account of the Ascension" not being read until the Ascension, according to the rubric of the Evangelistarion. Thus, the first, fourth, fifth, seventh, eighth, and tenth eōthina gospels are read in the Matins of the Sundays of Thomas, the Myrrhbearers, the Paralytic, the Samaritan, the Blind man, and the Holy Fathers, respectively; and the third in the Matins of the Ascension, but the ninth, sixth, and eleventh in the Divine Liturgy of Thomas, the Ascension, and the Saturday before Pentecost, respectively. The second eōthinon gospel is part of the pericope of the Divine Liturgy of the Sunday of the Myrrhbearers. The Sunday of Pascha again remains outside of the numbering. Besides, the reading of a gospel during the service of the Resurrection is again something modern. And here,

415. As Phountoulēs just stated above, "For every Sunday, each tone has two resurrectional prokeimena and an allēlouarion. The first prokeimenon is intended for the eōthinon gospel, the second for the epistle, and the allēlouarion for the gospel of the Divine Liturgy."

the Sunday of Inauguration,[416] namely, the Sunday of Thomas, is a beginning.

In their effort to calculate the cycle of the eōthina gospels, the editors of the kanonia connected them with the tones, the prokeimena of the epistles, and the epistle pericopes (which thus they freed from their pairing with certain gospel pericopes), incorrectly determined the cycle of the pericopes, and dragged our liturgical practice and printed editions into these errors up until nowadays.

And in order to conclude this most long answer, we do not find a more appropriate conclusion than for us to repeat the ending sentences of G. Bekatōros in the preface of the *Taxis* for the year 1956, pp. 10–11: "We humbly submit the prayer to the Governing Church,[417] and indeed to the Governance of its Mother,[418] that it might engage in the scholarly revision of the Evangelistarion. And to do this because we are convinced that through serious work it is possible for the Evangelistarion that prescribes the time for reading of the gospels and epistles to be made not only free from inconsistencies in it, but also harmonized with the rubrics of the Typikon and such correct ones from the ancient taxis. In this way, the proper taxis will also prevail on this point of divine worship."[419]

416. "Κυριακὴ τῶν Ἐγκαινίων."

417. The term "Governing Church" (τὴν Διοικοῦσαν Ἐκκλησίαν) refers to the hierarchy of the Church of Greece.

418. "τὴν Διοίκησιν τῆς Μητρὸς τοιαύτης." The Ecumenical Patriarchate.

419. Γεώργιος Μπεκατῶρος, *Τάξις τῶν Ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθιῶν 1957: κατὰ τὸ Τυπικὸν τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1957), 10–11.

## 433

**During the year 1984, the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross coincided with the feast of the Annunciation. According to the Typikon, while both services are chanted together, the epistle of the feast and the gospel reading of the Cross were omitted in the Divine Liturgy. Would it not be more consistent and consequently more correct for both these readings to also be read, since this is what is done on the Holy Mountain?**

In the above case, the current modern Typika of Kōnstantinos[420] and Violakēs[421] provide for a reading of the epistle for the Veneration of the Cross and of the Gospel for the Annunciation. On the basis of this rubric, the omission of the two other pericopes took place, since in parishes, as is well known and as we saw in previous answers, double readings are no longer read. In the specific cases of the feast of the Annunciation and other similar feasts, but particularly, "Concerning Epistle and Gospel," in the introduction of the Typikon of G. Violakēs (§ 42, pp. 36–37, M. Saliveros, in Athens 1921),[422] the pertinent rubrics have been established, which, implementing the principle for only one pair of readings to be read during the Divine Liturgy, prescribe when the epistle or gospel of the Sunday or the feast will be given preference, and when only the readings of the feast or only of Sundays will be said. In the prescription of these rubrics, both authors of our modern Typika did not obviously introduce a new practice but copied whatever before them had gradually become prevalent in the Great Church. This taxis became prevalent through these Typika also within the Greek Orthodox churches that were dependent or under the influence of the taxis of the Patriarchate.

Conversely, the Typikon of Saint Sabas and all the modern monastic Typika that follow it, as well as the Slavic Typikon, do not rec-

420. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, *Πρωτοψάλτης, Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 129.

421. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 36–37.

422. The text incorrectly cited § 12.

ognize this omission of pericopes, but prescribe double or even triple pericopes to be read, when adding also the readings for the feast or of the saint being celebrated to the Sunday epistle and gospel. Indeed, this takes place in those instances where the services are chanted together and not on great feasts of the Lord, the service of which is chanted without mixture, even if it happens on Sunday. Naturally as it is noted also in the question, this is more correct and consistent. Namely, inasmuch as both events are celebrated together and both services are chanted together, how would it be logical for the reading to be omitted that belongs to each one and often even constitutes the center around which the celebration and service turns and would constitute the subject of the teaching in the homily that follows? In the case that the question raises, as well as in the similar case of the coincidence of the Annunciation with the other Sundays of Great Lent, it is sufficiently apparent. However, in other cases, it is even more acute. For example, relying on the introduction of Violakēs's Typikon, if the Annunciation coincides with the Saturday of Lazarus or Palm Sunday, only the gospel of Lazarus or Palm Sunday is read respectively in the Liturgy, not that of the feast, which narrates the event of the Annunciation. The same thing occurs if the feast of the Meeting of Christ coincides with a Sunday of the Triōdion. Conversely, again, gospels of Sundays are omitted if they coincide on these feasts of the Forerunner, of the Chief and Twelve Apostles, the Evangelists, the Three Hierarchs, and the Holy Fathers of the Councils. In cases of the two feasts of the Mother of God, a certain remedy is applied, since the feast's gospel for the Liturgy is transferred to the Matins. However, the benefit is virtually insignificant, since the gospel of the feast is heard by very few and is omitted during the Divine Liturgy's great synaxis of the faithful.[423] Moreover, I do not know whether the omission of the Sunday gospels, when they coincide with the feasts of the great saints, which we mentioned above, can be considered in accordance with ecclesiastical tradition, which with particular piety always adhered to the sequence of read-

423. This is an allusion to the fact that attendance is sparse at Matins in the Greek Orthodox Church.

ings from the Kyriakodromion[424] and did not omit them unless it coincided with a Sunday of the great feasts of the Lord.

This taxis of reciting double readings is provided for, as we said above, by the "Typikon" of Saint Sabas and by all the late manuscript Typika from the Holy Mountain (for example, of the Monasteries of Dionysiou, Grēgoriou, Kōnstamonitou, Xēropotamou, Panteleēmonos, and Hagiou Pavlou, which we saw) and by the Typikon that is observed even nowadays in the Slavic churches. Certainly, on the Holy Mountain, piety for the most holy Theotokos, protectress of the sacred place, is expressed also with the reading of the epistle and gospel of the Mother of God along with the sequential pericopes in virtually most Liturgies of the year, indeed with tendencies of putting the epistle and gospel of the Theotokos first in order.

Characteristic is the notation from the *Codex Kōnstamonitou 287* of the sixteenth century, which associates this practice with the name of Saint Philotheos Kokkinos, the patriarch of Constantinople: "That Patriarch Lord Philotheos of blessed memory said that on such feasts, in which during Matins a canon of the Theotokos is chanted, the epistle and gospel of the Theotokos must be said before that of the saint during the Liturgies. At any rate, this took place on such days, namely, on only ones, which happened to have that[425] in the Liturgy" (f. 153).

The practice of reading double pericopes must be very old. And while we cannot find an explicit pertinent general rubric in the manuscripts, we encounter it in every individual case, either being commonly implied as self-evident, or even being explicitly stated. Thus, among the manuscript Typika that A. Dmitrievskii published,[426] the Typikon of the Monastery of the Evergetis (*National*

424. κυριακοδρόμιον, τό (pl. κυριακοδρόμια, τά). kyriakodromion (pl. kyriakodromia). This term can designate a book containing the cycle of gospel and epistle readings for Sundays and pertinent homilies, or the cycle of Sunday gospel and epistle readings in general.

425. The epistle and gospel of the Theotokos.

426. The Typika are published in А. А. Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, хранящихся въ библиотекахъ Православного Востока, 3 vols. (Киев: Г. Т. Корчакъ-Новицкаго, 1895–1917).

*Library of Athens 788* of thirteenth century),[427] of the Monastery of Saint Nikolaos of Casole[428] (*Codex Barberini 69 III* from the year 1205), and other monastic Typika from the codices of *Sinai 1096* from the twelfth century, *Sinai 1097* from the year 1214, *M. Lavras Λ 99* from the thirteenth century, *Vatopediou 320 (931)* from the year 1346, and *Simōnos Petras 177* from the sixteenth century, provide for double readings in various instances of celebrating the Annunciation, even if it coincides with the day of Pascha Sunday. The Typikon of the Monastery of the Savior in Messina from the year 1131 also explicitly prescribes double pericopes for March 9 and 25, and for the Saturday of Meatfare as well as for the one before Pentecost.[429] Still elsewhere, this Typikon suggests or left this as optional (for example, on October 26 "of Saint Dēmētrios, but if you wish also of the earthquake")[430] or in instances of other double feasts, it selects an

427. For another edition of the text and in addition, a translation, see Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.5–6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2000–2005).

428. This monastery (Ἡ μονὴ τοῦ ἁγίου Νικολάου τῶν Κασούλων) was founded in 1098/99 under the patronage of Bohemund, prince of Taranto and Antioch. The Typikon is dated 1173. This discussion is based on the study that summarizes recent scholarship by Mattia C. Chiriatti, "El Typikón de Sant Nicolás de Casole: un monasterio, un scriptorium, y una bibliotheca," *Estudios bizantinos* 4 (2016): 107–121. For another edition of the Typikon, see A. Apostolidis, *Il typikon di S. Nicola di Casole secondo il codice Taur. Gr. C III 17* (Ph.D. Thesis, Ponticia Università S. Tommaso D'Aquino in Roma, 1984). For additional analysis of this Typikon, see Barbara Crostini and Ines Angeli Murzaku, eds., *Greek Monasticism in Southern Italy: The Life of Neilos in Context* (London: Routledge, 2018).

429. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 188, 276.

430. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 45. For a discussion of earthquakes and their effects on the Typikon, see Brian Croke, "Two Early Byzantine Earthquakes and their Liturgical Commemoration," *Byzantion* 51 (1981): 122–147; Mark Roosien, "The Liturgical Commemoration of Earthquakes in Late Antique Constantinople: At the Intersection of Ritual, Environment, and Empire" (PhD diss., The University of Notre Dame, 2018); Antti Arjava, "The Mystery Cloud of 536 CE in the Mediterranean Sources," *DOP* 59 (2005): 73–94; Glanville Downey, "Earthquakes at Constantinople and Vicinity, A.D. 342–1454," *Speculum* 30 (1955): 596–600; and

epistle of the one and a gospel of the other (for example, September 1, January 1, and so forth). The rubric that is recorded for the feast of the Transfiguration, "if the Transfiguration comes to take place on Sunday, we chant none of the resurrectional hymns, yet neither do we say an eōthinon gospel or that of the Sunday Liturgy," implies that only in similar instances of great feasts of the Lord could the "regular"[431] gospel of Sunday be omitted.[432]

In summarizing the above witnesses, we can come to the certain conclusion that according to the monastic Typika of the twelfth century (namely, as far as the information from our sources extends) up until nowadays, certainly according to an older tradition, when a Sunday coincides with a feast and the resurrectional service is chanted together with the service of the feast, double readings of Sunday and the feast are read.

What might have been the corresponding practice in the parish temples before the dominance of monastic Typikon in them? Unfortunately, the witnesses preserved are very scarce and not that clear. Virtually the only known source is the Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople from the codices of *Patmos 266* and *Timiou Staurou 40* of the tenth century. The likewise "asmatic"/parish Typikon of Saint Sophia of Thessaloniki, which Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki (d. 1429) wrote, and which is preserved in the *Codex Athens 2047*, does not mention readings. In contrast, the former indicates the readings that are provided being recited during the Divine Liturgy for every feast of the Mēnologion and for every day of the Triōdion and Pentēkostarion, as well as also the beginning and end ("ἀρχοτέλειαι") of the epistles and gospels of Saturdays and Sundays of the year from Pentecost up until the Sunday of Meatfare.[433] For many double feasts and commemorations of saints, it has double readings ("also

---

Emanuela Guidoboni, *Catalogue of ancient earthquakes in the Mediterranean area up to the 10th century* (Bologna: Istituto Nationale di Geofisica, 1994).

431. "ἐνόρδιον."

432. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 175.

433. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:140–167.

another epistle,"[434] "also the other epistle,"[435] "but this is also said,"[436] "but also the other epistle is said,"[437] or "another gospel,"[438] "and the other gospel,"[439] "and again a gospel,"[440] "but also the other gospel is said,"[441] and so forth). However, it does not explicitly say whether both readings were read without fail or whether they chose one of them. The first is more likely (see, "but this is also said"[442]). Still, on other double feasts, it does not have double readings, but an epistle of the one and a gospel of the other. It does not make special mention of instances where the feast and a Sunday coincided. However, perhaps this silence is an argument *ex silentio* for reading double readings. Otherwise, a relevant provision ought to exist, whether in general or case-by-case, namely, what epistle or gospel ought to be chosen every time, indeed much more in the practice of the Great Church, where the celebration of the commemoration of the Fathers of the Councils and other great saints of the Church by transfer to a Sunday was very frequent.

Moreover, in the Praxapostoloi and in the Evangelistaria, which survive in manuscripts, and which preserve the practice of parish temples, double and triple pericopes for each one of the saints being celebrated together are described in the Mēnologion. However, also here it is not clear whether they read all the pericopes or made a selection. In any case, it is indisputable that they read more epistles or gospels for the great feasts (Nativity, Theophany, Exaltation), which had forefeast and afterfeast pericopes. For these instances, there also exists a pertinent standard rubric in the Evangelistarion of the *Codex Paris 194 A* also from the year 1255: "for the afterfeast days of the Nativity of Christ, namely, from the twenty-eighth up until the thirty-first, the afterfeast take precedence on each day and, thus, those

434. "καὶ ἄλλος ἀπόστολος."
435. "καὶ ἕτερος ἀπόστολος."
436. "λέγεται δὲ καὶ οὗτος."
437. "λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἕτερος ἀπόστολος."
438. "ἄλλο εὐαγγέλιον."
439. "καὶ ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον."
440. "καὶ ἔτι εὐαγγέλιον."
441. "λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον."
442. "λέγεται δὲ καὶ οὗτος."

for the saint are made subordinate. Likewise, also, this is the case for the forefeast days and the afterfeast days for the feast of Lights."

When the monastic Typikon became prevalent also in the parishes, double pericopes were certainly read, as the present-day practice of the Slavic churches demonstrates. When and why the reading was restricted to only one pair of readings, we cannot precisely know. Certainly, this took place during the period of the Tourkokratia[443] and, in any event, it must be placed within the entire effort of lessening the length of the monastic services and of their adaptation to the capacities of the faithful living in the world, when indeed the Divine Liturgy is celebrated consecutively with Matins. In the first phase, the abridgments of the services were done at the expense of the biblical elements (kathismata of the Psalter, psalms of Lamp-lighting and lauds, stichologia of the odes, readings of the Old Testament of the Vespers of the Nativity, Theophany, and Great Saturday). Later, they expanded also to hymnography (odes of the canons, antiphons of the Divine Liturgy). In the first phase of the adjustments, the omission of the double readings in the Divine Liturgy also must have begun, which also finally became prevalent.

In a previous answer, we noted that the return to an older system of reading double pericopes in the Divine Liturgy is not easy, perhaps also not desirable, if it is the case of the same pericopes of the Mēnologion being repeated every time. However, in certain serious exceptional instances, when the epistle or gospel pericope is referring to the event being celebrated, double readings ought to be said. Precisely such instances are both the feasts of Meeting of Christ and the Annunciation when they coincide with the Sundays of the Triōdion. Perhaps, for a second reason, the same thing could also occur for all the Sundays that coincide with the feasts of the Mother of God and the feasts that § 42 of the Typikon's introduction mentions, even for temples where they are named in commemoration of specific saints, when their celebration coincides with a Sunday. This would simplify, in a more correct and indeed more traditional way, the pertinent

443. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

complex rubrics of the Typikon and would also lessen the potential mistakes that occur in their implementation.

## 434

**Instead of "We have seen the true light…,"[444] what troparion must be chanted during the Saturday of Souls of Pentecost, "Remember also us, O Merciful One..."[445] or "You who with profound wisdom…?"[446]**

The two well-known modern printed Typika of Kōnstantinos and Violakēs do not agree. The first prescribes, "Remember also us, O Merciful One..." of Great Saturday[447] and the second, "You who with profound wisdom…," namely, the funereal apolytikion of the day, because it considers, "Remember also us, O Merciful One...," as inappropriate (see note 14 on pp. 388–389 of the edition of 1921, "We ignore the Typikon of Kōnstantinos, from where was derived that 'Remember also us, O Merciful One...,' of Great Saturday was also set for today, which the committee finds inappropriate and prescribed the first apolytikion of the souls…"[448]). The Typikon of Saint Sabas makes no mention at all of this question. Moreover, the late manuscript Typika of the Holy Mountain either are silent, such as the Typikon of Hagiou Pavlou, or prescribe "Remember also us,

444. "Εἴδομεν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν..."

445. "Μνήσθητι, εὔσπλαχνε, καὶ ἡμῶν..." The full text of hymn is, "Μνήσθητι, εὔσπλαχνε, καὶ ἡμῶν, καθὼς ἐμνημόνευσας τοῦ ληστοῦ, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν" (Remember also us, O merciful One, as you remembered the thief in the kingdom of heaven).

446. "Ὁ βάθει σοφίας..." The full text of hymn is, "Ὁ βάθει σοφίας φιλανθρώπως πάντα οἰκονομῶν, καὶ τὸ συμφέρον πᾶσιν ἀπονέμων μόνε Δημιουργέ, ἀνάπαυσον Κύριε τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν δούλων σου· ἐν σοὶ γὰρ τὴν ἐλπίδα ἀνέθεντο, τῷ ποιητῇ καὶ πλάστῃ καὶ Θεῷ ἡμῶν" (You who with profound wisdom governs all things lovingly towards humankind, and assigns to all what is beneficial, O Only Creator, give rest to the souls of your servants for they set their hope in you, our creator and fashioner and God).

447. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 254.

448. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 388–389, n. 14. The reference was corrected from citing page 388 alone.

O Merciful One...," such as the Typika of Grēgoriou, Dionysiou, Kōnstamonitou, and the hieromonk Methodios,[449] or prefer "You who with profound wisdom...," as the Typikon of the monastery of Xēropotamou. Perhaps also the other modern Typika of the monasteries of Mount Athos, or even those outside of it, which were not accessible to us, display an analogous variety. However, perhaps this would do little good, because such issues are not settled in any manner by a system of "majority voting."

The answer's difficulty is due to two reasons. First, to the fact that the Saturday of Souls of Pentecost is found between a leavetaking of the feast of the Ascension (Friday) and the feast of Pentecost. Thus, it is not possible to chant on it, "You ascended in glory...,"[450] because the feast has been completed, but neither also "Blessed are you, O Christ our God..." of Pentecost or "We have seen the true light...," which begins to be chanted from the Monday of the Holy Spirit. The parallel example of the Saturday of Meatfare does not assist us, because "We have seen the true light..." is chanted there, which here has no place.

The second difficulty is derived from the absence of more ancient witnesses who would illuminate our problem. "We have seen the true light..." or the apolytikia that are chanted instead of it, have been recently introduced into the Liturgy, probably during the period of the Tourkokratia.[451] Thus, we do not have witnesses regarding these matters from manuscripts nor from the Fathers who commented on the Divine Liturgy. Our professor Panagiōtes Trem-

449. Μεθόδιος Ἱερομόναχος Σιμωνοπετρίτης ὁ Ἡλιοπολίτης, *Τυπικὸν ἢ Τυπικαὶ Σημειώσεις* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἔκδοσις Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σίμωνος Πέτρας, 2016), 392. Methodios (1841–1917 or 1920), a hieromonk of Mount Athos, was born in Aydin (Asia Minor), was tonsured a monk in 1862 at the Monastery of Simōnos Petras on the Holy Mountain, served as the Secretary for the Sacred Community, resided in the kalyvē of the Transfiguration in the Skete of Kavsokalyvia, lived in a hermitage located in the area of Kerasia, and eventually spent his remaining life in the cave of Saint Athanasios (d. ca. 1003) near the Monastery of the Great Lavra. He was also active in the composition of hymnography. His work on the Typikon was produced in 1890.

450. "Ἀνελήφθης ἐν δόξῃ ..."

451. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

pelas of blessed memory confirms that in more than eighty manuscripts, which he used for the publication of the Liturgies, in not one of them does he encounter "We have seen the true light...," nor naturally also an indication of another hymn instead of it (*The Three Liturgies According to the Codices in Athens*, Athens 1935, p. 149).[452] Certainly, this does not mean that up until the eighteenth century—which the manuscripts that he studied extend up to—"We have seen the true light..." had still not yet been introduced. Their silence is not only explained by the conservatism of the tradition and of the scribes of the liturgical texts, but also by the fact that whatever the people would have said at this point did not interest the priests, for whom these codices were intended. However, in various old Typika that are preserved, again no mention occurs regarding these troparia, either because they were not yet chanted or because "they were said by custom" not according to the formal and correct taxis. This not only explains the silence, but also the differences among the modern Typika.

In order for us to able to understand and, consequently, to give a correct, as far as possible, solution to this question, we must make a small retrospection, by necessity slightly hypothetical, into the pertinent tradition.

The various sources attest that not only did they chant the koinōnikon during the communion of the priests, such as nowadays, but they continued it also during the communion of the people. The calling of the people in order to approach holy communion "With fear of God..."[453]—or originally with only "Draw near"[454]—did not exist, and when introduced, it did not interrupt the chanting of the koinōnikon. Neither also did the blessing, "Save, O God, your people...,"[455] which seals holy communion, exist originally. The koinōnikon was interrupted when the communion of the clergy and people concluded and immediately they chanted, "Let our mouths

452. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 149.
453. "Μετὰ φόβου Θεοῦ..."
454. "Προσέλθετε"
455. "Σῶσον ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαόν σου..."

be filled…,'" which according to the *Chronicon Paschale,*[456] was introduced into the Divine Liturgy in 624 (AD) during the reign of the patriarch Sergios.[457] We also have something parallel in the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, where, after the communion of the faithful and the end of the koinōnikon, "Fill my mouth with praise, Lord…" is appended without the insertion of any blessing according to the pattern of "Save, O God, your people…."[458] The *Chronicon Paschale* records characteristically, "After all partook of the holy Mysteries… and the last verse of the koinōnikon was chanted [it was decreed] that this troparion also be said, 'Let our mouths be filled….'"[459] We find this archaic practice quite distinctly in the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. As is well known, verse 9 ("Taste and see…")[460] of Psalm 33 ("I will bless the Lord at all times…)[461] is its koinōnikon. What is chanted after "Save, O God, your people…" is nothing other than a repetition of the first verse of the psalm and of the verse of the koinōnikon with a small eucharistic addition ("I will bless the Lord at all times, his praise will continually be in my mouth [Heavenly Bread and Cup of Life] taste and see that the Lord is good. Alleluia. Alleluia. Alleluia").[462]

Because of the infrequent approach of the people to holy communion at this point, certain changes took place. The koinōnikon was restricted only to the partaking of the clergy and was separated from "Let our mouths be filled…," which eventually also itself was forgotten in the Greek-speaking parish churches. Moreover, Chris-

456. "This is the conventional title for a Byzantine universal chronicle, probably written in the 630s," Barry Baldwin, "Chronicon Paschale," *ODB*, 1:447. On the *Chronicon Paschale*, see the insightful analysis by David Olster, *The Politics of Usurpation in the Seventh Century: Rhetoric and Revolution in Byzantium* (Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert, 1993).

457. Sergios I, patriarch of Constantinople (r. 610–638).

458. B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 120.

459. Ludwig August Dindorf, *Chronicon Paschale ad exemplar Vaticanum* (Bonn: Impensis Ed. Weberi, 1832), 1:714.

460. "Γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε…"

461. "Εὐλογήσω τὸν Κύριον ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ…"

462. "Εὐλογήσω τὸν Κύριον ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ διὰ παντὸς ἡ αἴνεσις αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ στόματί μου. [Ἄρτον οὐράνιον καὶ ποτήριον ζωῆς] γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ Κύριος. Ἀλληλούϊα. Ἀλληλούϊα. Ἀλληλούϊα."

tological symbolisms produced the introduction of "Always, now and ever..."[463] and other words or practices in remembrance of the Ascension of the Lord where its symbolism had been located at this point of the Divine Liturgy. At the same time, the symbolism of the Holy Spirit's descent on Pentecost was also highlighted, either with the symbolic explanation of the offering of the incense that took place at this time (see Germanos of Constantinople, *Ecclesiastical History and Mystical Contemplation*, Theodōros of Andida, *Summary Commentary*,[464] 38, "The last censing represents the grace of the Holy Spirit which is given by infusion to the apostles after the Resurrection."[465]), or with the modification of the phrase "Blessed is our God, always..."[466] to "Blessed is our God who illumines and hal-

463. "Πάντοτε, νῦν καὶ ἀεί..."

464. Theodōros of Andida (twelfth century) is little known except for the work, *Προθεωρία κεφαλαιώδης περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ λειτουργίᾳ γινομένων συμβόλων καὶ μυστηρίων πονηθεῖσα ἐκ προτροπῆς καὶ ἀξιώσεως τοῦ Θεοφιλεστάτου ἐπισκόπου Φυτείας Βασιλείου* (*Summary Commentary concerning the symbols and mysteries occurring in the Divine Liturgy, composed at the behest and request of His Eminence Basileios, bishop of Phyteia*) (PG 140:417–468). According to René Bornert, the *Προθεωρία* is the earlier writing of Nikolaos of Andida, which was revised and abridged by Theodōros, who may have been a later successor to the same episcopal see. Bornert dates the original work of Nikolaos between 1055–1063. J. Darrouzès disagrees with Bornert and dates the work before 1100, most likely between 1085–1095. For this discussion, see René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966), 181–206, and J. Darrouzès, "Nicolas d'Andida et les azyme," *Revue des études byzantines* 32 (1974): 199–203. For a theological analysis of the work, see Hans-Joachim Schulz, *The Byzantine Liturgy* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1986), 89–99. Additional studies include Roland Betancourt, "A Byzantine Liturgical Commentary in Verse: Introduction and Translation," OCP 81 (2015): 433–472 and Barbara Crostini, "Interpreting the Interpreters: The Principles and Aims of the Protheoria," *Ostkirchliche Studien* 42 (1993): 51–59. The translation of the terms "Προθεωρία κεφαλαιώδης" as "Summary Commentary" is based on Betancourt's study, who has written overviews of Nikolaos and Theodōros of Andida for a forthcoming work, Michael Grünbart and Alexander Riehle, eds., *Lexikon byzantinischer Autoren* (Leipzig: Akademie Verlag). Cited 4 December 2019. Online at: https://www.academia.edu/1863449/Entries_for_Nikolaos_von_Andida_and_Theodoros_von_Andida_

465. PG 140:465b.

466. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, πάντοτε..."

lows…"[467] (a manuscript scroll of Esphigmenou from the year 1306) or the introduction of troparia, such as "O Heavenly King…"[468] and "O Lord, your All-holy Spirit…,"[469] which were said by the priest before the communion of the faithful (*Patmos 719* of the thirteenth century). But also, the use of zeon gave rise to its reference in similar symbolisms. According to Nikolaos Kabasilas, the warm water was significative "of the Holy Spirit's descent upon the Church…For the water, which at the same time is water and partakes of fire, signifies the Holy Spirit, who is also often called water and who appeared as fire when he descended upon the disciples of Christ. This moment signifies that moment. For, He descended at that time after all the mysteries of Christ had been accomplished, but now, the sacred gifts having been perfected, this water is added" (*On the Divine Liturgy*, 37.4–5).[470] Its pouring into the holy chalice was accompanied with phrase, "Fervor of the Holy Spirit"[471] (compare also "Fullness of the Holy Spirit"[472] during the commixture) and the troparion of the canon of Pentecost "Divine bath of regeneration…"[473] (in many manuscripts of the sixteenth century and following). Within this climate, we could include and also explain the introduction of the troparion from the Vespers of Pentecost, "We have seen the true light…," which is absolutely in harmony with the commentaries of Kabasilas.

However, the chanting of this troparion was judged to be inappropriate on Pascha and feasts of the Lord. It was to be expected, perhaps in imitation of the services of Vespers and Matins, for the applicable apolytikion of the feast—brief, festive and known to the people—to be preferred. For Great Thursday, the troparion, "Of your mystical supper…,"[474] was chosen, which is also chanted as a

467. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ φωτίζων καὶ ἁγιάζων…"
468. "Βασιλεῦ οὐράνιε…"
469. "Κύριε, ὁ τὸ πανάγιόν σου Πνεῦμα…"
470. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 37.4–5 (SC 4bis:228–229).
471. "Ζέσις Πνεύματος ἁγίου."
472. "Πλήρωμα Πνεύματος ἁγίου."
473. "Λουτρὸν τὸ θεῖον τῆς παλιγγενεσίας…"
474. "Τοῦ δείπνου σου τοῦ μυστικοῦ…"

koinōnikon on that day. Its repetition after communion and, "Save, O God, your people...," recalls the original practice of repeating the verse of the koinōnikon, which we also saw in the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. "Remember also us, O Merciful One..."[475] (a troparion which is first encountered in the series of troparia from the Beatitudes of the second tone in the Liturgy of the Sunday of the Myrrhbearers—not, however also in the Paraklētikē—and in the service of the funeral of monks) resembles the original refrain/ephymnion, which could be associated with the troparion, "Of your mystical supper...," the end of which has many common elements (thief, "you remembered"—remember, kingdom).[476] Perhaps it is not accidental that it is found in this position as an optional troparion for Great Thursday according to the Typikon of Kōnstantinos (but only in its first edition): "Instead of 'We have seen the true light' again 'Of your mystical supper.' But if you wish, 'Remember also us, O Merciful One....'"[477] This troparion is provided for Great Saturday by all the modern Typika.

Now, for the Saturday of Pentecost, we have to choose between two possibilities: 1) the imitation of the practice for the feasts of the Lord, and 2) the imitation of Great Saturday. I think that the second is preferable. The Saturday of Souls is not a feast of the Lord and its apolytikion is more penitential and mournful than joyful and, consequently, appropriate to express the sentiments of the faithful who partook of the Lord's supper. Moreover, it also appears inconsistent, on the one hand, for "We have seen the true light..." to be chanted

475. "Μνήσθητι, εὔσπλαγχνε, καὶ ἡμῶν..."

476. "Τοῦ Δείπνου σου τοῦ μυστικοῦ, σήμερον, Υἱὲ Θεοῦ, κοινωνόν με παράλαβε·οὐ μὴ γὰρ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς σου τὸ Μυστήριον εἴπω· οὐ φίλημά σοι δώσω, καθάπερ ὁ Ἰούδας· ἀλλ' ὡς ὁ ληστὴς ὁμολογῶ σοι· Μνήσθητί μου, Κύριε, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου" (Of your mystical supper, O Son of God, receive me as communicant today. For I will not speak of the mystery to your enemies, I will not give you a kiss, just as Judas. But as the thief, I confess to you: Remember me, O Lord, in your kingdom). "Μνήσθητι, εὔσπλαχνε, καὶ ἡμῶν, καθὼς ἐμνημόνευσας τοῦ ληστοῦ, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν" (Remember also us, O merciful One, as you remembered the thief in the kingdom of heaven).

477. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὸ ὕφος τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Ἐκ τῆς Τυπογραφίας τῶν Ἀδελφῶν Ἰγνατιαδῶν, 1838), 184.

on the First Saturday of Souls, while on the other, for "You who with profound wisdom…" to be chanted on the second one. "Remember also us, O Merciful One…" and a troparion of the Lord are also very compatible with the theme of holy communion. It harmonizes better also with "Remember,"[478] which is so often repeated in the Divine Liturgy by reason of the thief (compare "May the Lord God remember all of you…,"[479] "Remember, Lord…,"[480] "Remember me, Master…,"[481] and so forth), and with the theme of the kingdom of heaven, with the glorification of which the Divine Liturgy begins and within the climate of which the mystery of the Holy Eucharist is moving and is carried out (compare "for the fullness of the kingdom of heaven,"[482] "for inheritance of the kingdom of heaven,"[483] and so forth).

## 435

**In the pericope from the Gospel according to Matthew, which we read during the Vespers of Great Friday, it is said that one of the crucified thieves blasphemed Christ and the other one rebuked the blasphemer and said, "Remember me, O Lord…."[484] A little below, it records, "and the thieves who were crucified with him reviled him in the same way."[485] Does a contradiction exist here, which is even commented on by some?**

The above lengthy pericope is entitled as a reading from the Gospel according to Matthew, but, as it is also stated in the references that usually are recorded at the beginning and in the introduction of the readings, it has two insertions, one from the Gospel according to Luke and another from the Gospel according to John. Thus, while the text of Matthew proceeds normally (27:1–61), four verses from the Gospel according to Luke (23:39–42) are inserted between

478. "Μνήσθητι Κύριε."
479. "Πάντων ὑμῶν μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεός…"
480. "Μνήσθητι Κύριε…"
481. "Μνήσθητι δέσποτα…"
482. "εἰς βασιλείας οὐρανῶν πλήρωμα."
483. "εἰς βασιλείας οὐρανῶν κληρονομίαν."
484. Based on Luke 23:42.
485. Matt 27:44.

verses 38 and 39 and seven verses from the Gospel according to John (19:31–37) are inserted between 54 and 55. Obviously, this takes place in order that missing elements from the narrative of Matthew are supplemented; the repentance of the one thief in the first instance and the piercing of Christ's side in the second instance. This manner of the evangelists complementing one another in this pericope is also attested to by the Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople from the codices *Patmos 466* and *Timiou Staurou 40* of the tenth century: "Gospel according to Matthew, chapter 317, 'At that time, all the chief priest and elders took counsel…'[486] and he says up until, 'and one on the left,'[487] and he returns to the Gospel according to Luke, *in chapter 325, and says, 'one of the hanged,'*[488] *and says until, 'you will be with me in paradise,'*[489] *and he returns to the Gospel according to Matthew* to chapter 337, and says, 'and the ones passing by blasphemed him,'[490] and says up until, 'truly this was a Son of God,'[491] and he returns to the Gospel according to John, chapter 205, and says, 'Therefore, the Jews, in order to prevent the bodies from remaining on the cross,'[492] and says up until, 'They shall look on him whom they have pierced,'[493] and again he returns to the Gospel according to Matthew, to chapter 347, 'there were also many women there,'[494] finally, 'opposite the sepulcher.'[495]"[496] We have a similar instance also in the gospel reading of the Vespers

486. Matt 27:1.
487. Matt 27:38.
488. Luke 23:39.
489. Luke 23:43.
490. Matt 27:39.
491. Matt 27:54.
492. John 19:31.
493. John 19:37.
494. Matt 27:55.
495. Matt 27:61.
496. Mateos, *Le Typicon*, 2:80. The section italicized above appears to have been omitted in error ("εἰς κεφ. τκε', καὶ λέγει· 'εἷς δὲ τῶν κρεμασθέντων,' καὶ λέγει ἕως· μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ,' καὶ ὑποστρέφει εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον," "in chapter 325, and says, 'one of the hanged," and says until, 'you will be with me in paradise,' and he returns to the Gospel according to Matthew"). The omitted text from the Typikon is translated and included in the quotation to avoid confusion.

of Great Friday, where the basic narrative is again taken from the Gospel according to Matthew (26:1–27:2) with two pericopes supplementing the narrative from John (13:3–17, the foot-washing) and from Luke (22:43–45, the appearance of the angel at Gethsemane). And here the insertions do not create problems. However, there is a problem in the case of the pericope of the Vespers of Great Friday, which few perhaps notice, but this does not mean that it is not quite serious.

It is well known that among the narratives of the evangelists, there are certain differences that usually relate to details of historical events. In the case in question, Matthew (27:44) writes that both crucified thieves reviled Jesus, but Luke (23:39–42) says that only one blasphemed while the other rebuked the blasphemer and said to Jesus, "Remember me, O Lord...." Sacred commentary, which follows the opinion of Chrysostomos, reconciles both narratives: "Therefore, how does Luke say that the one rebukes? Both did, for while earlier both reviled, later no longer" (Sacred Chrysostomos, *Homily on Matthew*, 87.2).[497] In the readings of the services for the Holy Passions and the Great Hours of Great Friday, both the narratives of Matthew (27:33–54 — Seventh Gospel, and 27:1–56 — Gospel of the First Hour) and of Luke (23:32–49 — Eighth Gospel, and the same pericope — Gospel of the Sixth Hour) are read. However, here, since the text is presented as uniform and the entire pericope is ascribed in its title to Matthew, the variance of the narratives appears, for those who are paying attention to it, as a real contradiction in the text of the same evangelist.

Certainly, the explanation of Chrysostomos smooths out things, but not completely. And again, here in the text's sequence, first comes the repentance of the one thief and afterwards also the reviling of Christ by both. We must admit that the welding together of the pericopes took place somewhat artlessly, without taking care of the inversion that the insertion at this point of the pertinent verses from the Gospel according to Luke would create. It would have been more preferable and more consistent with the historical course of

497. PG 58:772.

events and with the hermeneutical clarification of Chrysostomos, if verses 23:39–42 of Luke were inserted between verses 44 and 45 of Matthew, namely, after the phrase, "and the thieves that were crucified with him reviled him in the same way."[498]

This would not be difficult to do by a responsible committee on a Pan-Orthodox basis, which would undertake the correction of our liturgical books and the improvement of the system of pericopes based on the evidence of tradition and the principles of hermeneutical and textual criticism of the holy Scriptures.

## 436

**What is the correct form of dismissal on Palm Sunday, simply "May He who deigned to be seated on the foal of a donkey…for our salvation"[499] or "May He who deigned to be seated on the foal of a donkey…and who rose from the dead"[500]?**

The dismissal of Palm Sunday is done, as it is recorded in all Euchologia and Hieratika, with "a special feature,"[501] as the Typikon calls it, of this feast of the Lord: "May He who deigned to be seated upon the foal of a donkey, for our salvation, Christ our true God."[502] We do not chant resurrectional elements on this feast, nor is "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ…"[503] said in Matins. The same thing also occurs during the Sunday of Pentecost and during other great feasts of the Lord, when they coincide with Sunday. Their dismissal is unmixed, given that their service is also unmixed and the resurrectional troparia are not chanted during them. The Typikon in use (G. Violakēs, *Typikon of the Great Church of Christ*, M. Saliveros, in Athens 1921, § 16 "Concerning the Dismissal in General," p. 13)[504] mentions a combination of a dismissal for a feast of the

498. Matt 27:44.

499. "Ὁ ἐπὶ πώλου ὄνου… διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν."

500. "Ὁ ἐπὶ πώλου ὄνου…καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν."

501. "ἰδιαίτερον χαρακτηριστικόν."

502. "Ὁ ἐπὶ πώλου ὄνου καθεσθῆναι καταδεξάμενος διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς ἡμῶν."

503. "Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι."

504. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 13. The incorrect reference to p. 12 is corrected to p.

Lord and a resurrectional one ("May He who was born in a cave and laid in a manger for our salvation and rose from the dead")[505] only for afterfeast Sundays and the leavetakings of feasts of the Lord, if they coincide with a Sunday, "when also the resurrectional elements precede in the Vespers of Saturday, in the Matins of Sunday, and in the Liturgy."[506] Here, on Palm Sunday, this rubric does not have application, because this is clearly the main day of the feast of the Lord and nothing resurrectional is chanted on it.

There would be no need for anyone to remain further on this topic, but the writer happened to hear this unfortunate combination of Palm Sunday's dismissal with the resurrectional one. Perhaps this is due to ignorance, but perhaps also to an incorrect interpretation of the rubric that we mentioned above, which concerns Sundays of afterfeast days of feasts of the Lord. Both on the Holy Mountain and in the Slavic churches, the dismissal of Palm Sunday is done without "rose from the dead."

In order for us to formulate the response more correctly, we must not say that since resurrectional elements are not chanted, both "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ..." is not said and "rose from the dead" is not added to the dismissal (as it is naively said many times), but that since the feast of the Lord of Palm Sunday dominates, it removes the resurrectional character of the Sunday and for this reason resurrectional elements are not chanted, "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ" is not said, and "rose from the dead" is not added to the dismissal.

---

13 in the translation.

505. "Ὁ ἐν σπηλαίῳ γεννηθεὶς καὶ ἐν φάτνῃ ἀνακλιθεὶς διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν."

506. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 14.

## 437

**In the Matins of Great Saturday (service of the Epitaphios), why is the exclamation "For you are the king of peace..."[507] said twice, after the third stasis of the lamentations and after the sixth ode of the canon?**

## 438

**When is it more correct for the exclamation "For you are the king of peace..." to be said during the service of the Epitaphios, immediately after the third stasis of the lamentations (*Great Week* book)[508] or after the evlogētaria (Triōdion)?**

The exclamation, "For you are the king of peace...," organically belongs to the sixth eōthinē prayer, "We give thanks to you, O Lord God of our salvation...,"[509] with the end of which it is conceptually connected, "crush invisible and warring enemies under their feet; for you are the king of peace...."[510] God, "king of peace," is the leader and supporter of the faithful in the war against the satanic powers hostile to God, the "invisible and warring enemies." This prayer (and its exclamation) belongs to the service of the "asmatic" and parish Matins, in which it is also included as a prayer of the sixth antiphon. By an influence of the "asmatic" Matins, it has also been introduced into the monastic Matins in the synaptē that is said "after the sixth" ode of the canon. In this position, only its exclamation has been preserved, while the prayer together with the exclamation is read, as is well known, along with other eōthines prayers during the recitation

507. "Σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς εἰρήνης..." The full exclamation is, "Σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς εἰρήνης καὶ σωτὴρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν, καὶ σοὶ τὴν δόξαν ἀναπέμπομεν, τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων" (For you are the king of peace and savior of our souls, and to you we send up glory, to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit).

508. Most likely, Κωνσταντῖνος Παπαγιάννης, ed., *Ἡ Ἁγία καὶ Μεγάλη Ἑβδομὰς περιέχουσα πᾶσας τὰς ἱερὰς ἀκολουθίας ἀπὸ τῆς Κυριακῆς τῶν Βαΐων μέχρι τῆς Κυριακῆς τοῦ Πάσχα* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 1985).

509. "Εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι, Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς τῶν σωτηρίων ἡμῶν...." The word, "eōthinē/ἐωθινή," here can be translated "early morning," rather than being associated with the eleven eōthina gospel readings.

510. "...σύντριψον ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν τοὺς ἀοράτους καὶ πολεμίους ἐχθρούς· σὺ γὰρ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς εἰρήνης..."

of the Six Psalms. Accordingly, the exclamation, "For you are the king of peace…," is found in its correct position between a sixth ode of the canon and a kontakion in the service of the Matins of Great Saturday.

Thus, in the first question, the quandary is centered on why the same exclamation is repeated during the lamentations and, in this case, according to the second question, what is its correct position, after the third stasis or after the evlogētaria. And this is because while the publications of the Triōdion and the Typikon of Saint Sabas[511] have it after the evlogētaria, the Typika of Kōnstantinos[512] and Violakēs[513] and the useful ancillary publications of Great Week (of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, Apostolikē Diakonia, and of Rēgopoulos) provide for it after the third stasis of the lamentations, namely, before the evlogētaria.[514] Let us note that the Triōdion of Phōs (Φῶς) publications has it three times, namely, after the sixth ode of the canon, after the third stasis of the lamentations, and after the evlogētaria.

At the outset, let it be made clear that it is a rare phenomenon for the same exclamation to be repeated in the same service more than one time, either because two different prayers conclude in the same exclamation, or because the exclamations are inserted in some manner, ungoverned by the various elements of the services, and are arbitrarily chosen from existing stereotypical and well-known exclamations. Thus, for example, in the Liturgy, we have the exclamation, "For to you are due all glory…,"[515] after the litany of peace, at the first prayer of the faithful, and even at the prayer of the entrance (although it said inaudibly). In the Matins, "For you are a

511. Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012), 345.

512. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 239.

513. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 363.

514. These books contain portions or full texts of services and are meant to help worshippers in following the celebrations.

515. "Ὅτι πρέπει σοι πᾶσα δόξα…"

merciful God who loves humankind..."[516] is said after the troparia for the king in the beginning and after the ektenēs towards the end. In unction, "For yours it is to show mercy and to save us..."[517] is said repeatedly. Similarly, in the funeral service, "For you are the Resurrection..."[518] is said repeatedly. In addition, in the Paraklēsis, in unction, and elsewhere, "For you are a merciful God who loves humankind..." is said repeatedly. If we exclude the funereal exclamation ("For you are the Resurrection..."), the exclamation of the ektenēs ("For you are a merciful God who loves humankind..."), and perhaps the above-mentioned exclamation of unction ("For yours it is to show mercy and to save us..."), where their repetition serves a particular liturgical purpose and is thought out and planned, in all other instances we perceive some anomaly in the framework of the service, usually a later arrangement or pasting of liturgical elements, which did not take place in an era of liturgical height.

Our case also falls into this latter category. On the basis of the evidence of the publications, which we mentioned above, and of the witnesses of the manuscripts that we were able to view, here is how the development of the service of the Epitaphios occurs in general terms, within which the double (or triple) exclamation is also included, to which the two questions refer.

In another instance, we noted that the service of the Epitaphios represents in some manner the funeral service of Christ. Around its end, namely, during the "asmatic" trisagion of the doxology, which is chanted according to the ancient Typika "since it is a custom for this to be chanted for the dead," and which for this reason is characterized by other Typika as "a funereal trisagion," the carrying out takes place of the Gospel book and of the later epitaphios/aër, which depicts the deceased Christ. In this way, the Gospel book was originally wrapped, and its "burial" took place on the holy table; the tomb and throne of Christ. As is clearly shown in manuscripts and in old printed editions, the funeral service of the faithful is precisely also nothing other than a Matins service, and the service

516. "Ὅτι ἐλεήμων καὶ φιλάνθρωπος..."
517. "Σὸν γάρ ἐστιν τὸ ἐλεεῖν καὶ σώζειν ἡμᾶς..."
518. "Ὅτι σὺ εἶ ἡ ἀνάστασις..."

of the Epitaphios, the funeral service of Christ. As we also emphasized previously, the epitaphios, the present-day koubouklion, is not the tomb, but the deathbed of Christ, "the sacred bier of the epitaphios,"[519] as certain manuscripts call it, the stone of the unnailing[520] according to tradition, around which the funeral service is chanted, the epitaphios lamentation. Thus, this Matins—a funeral service—smoothly follows the course and the well-known outline of the monastic Matins: The Six Psalms, "God is the Lord"[521] and the apolytikia, the amōmos,[522] its evlogētaria and kathismata, the canon, lauds, and the doxology. The readings are found at the end according to the ancient "asmatic" taxis and the service is concluded with the customary ektenēs, the plērōtika, and the dismissal. The customary synaptes and exclamations are inserted in between. This taxis is provided for by the old Typika and is conspicuous, despite the changes in the meantime, both in the printed Triōdia and Typika, and even in the modern ancillary liturgical books for Great Week. However, also in the Triōdia, much more in the modern Typika and in the ancillary publications, the taxis is spoiled precisely because of the modifications that gradually took place. And this had effects on the smooth flow of the service.

Namely, originally, the service of Matins for Great Saturday, at least according to certain old Typika, did not include the stichologia of the amōmos as a kathisma, since the stichologia of the Psalter is completed during Great Wednesday and is suspended during the remaining days of Great Week. However, the amōmos is later introduced, obviously in imitation of the regular funeral service, of which it constituted and continues to constitute a vital and striking element, to such an extent, that the terms "amōmos"[523] and "amōmoi"[524] and "funeral service"[525] are often used as synonyms. As

519. "ὁ τοῦ ἐπιταφίου ἱερὸς κράββατος."
520. "ὁ λίθος τῆς ἀποκαθηλώσεως." It is also otherwise known in English as, "the anointing stone."
521. "Θεὸς Κύριος."
522. Psalm 118.
523. "ἄμωμος."
524. "ἄμωμοι."
525. "νεκρώσιμος ἀκολουθία."

seen during the final Byzantine period, various known and unknown hymnographers composed short troparia for the three staseis of the amōmos, the well-known popular "lamentations."[526] Thus, gradually each verse of the amōmos also acquired a lamentation, which was inserted according to the stichologia of this psalm, as it is printed in the Triōdion (already by the edition of 1522)[527] and as occurs in some monasteries of the Holy Mountain and in Patmos also up until nowadays. The amōmos with the lamentations was chanted around the epitaphios and, from what it appears, the priest censed at the beginning of each stasis. No mention was originally made regarding synaptes and exclamations. However, it is very possible that swiftly, again in imitation of the practice in the funeral service, small synaptes and exclamations began to be inserted in between the staseis.

What were these exclamations? According to one late manuscript Typikon of the Monastery of Panteleēmon from the year 1841, but which echoes an older taxis, the first two exclamations were none other than the funereal "For you are the Resurrection, life, and repose...."[528] However, the same Typikon also recognizes the different practice of Constantinople and notes: "This [the exclamation] is not said in Constantinople." Obviously, in Constantinople, they said the exclamations that we find in printed Triōdia, the Typikon of Saint Sabas, and other manuscripts. The exclamation, "For blessed is your name...,"[529] was chosen for the end of the first stasis, which is regularly found in Matins after the chanting of the evlogētaria (compare both "Blessed are you, O Lord..."[530]— "blessed is your name"[531]).[532] Another Typikon surviving in manuscript in the Mon-

526. "ἐγκώμια."

527. *Τριῴδιον περιέχον τὴν πρέπουσαν αὐτῷ ἀκολουθίαν, Ἐνετίῃσι πόνῳ καὶ δεξιότητι Ἡρακλέους τοῦ Γεράλδου, ἀναλώμασι Ἀνδρέου τοῦ Κουνάδου τοῦ τὸ παλαιὸν γένος ἕλκοντος ἐκ τῆς τῶν Πατρῶν πόλεως τῆς Πελοποννήσου, χιλιοστῷ πεντακοσιοστῷ εἰκοστῷ δευτέρῳ. Μαρτίου ἐσχάτῃ φθίνοντος* (Venice: In aedibus Antonii et Fratrum de Sabio, 1522).

528. "Ὅτι σὺ εἶ ἡ ἀνάστασις, ἡ ζωή, καὶ ἡ ἀνάπαυσις..."

529. "Ὅτι ηὐλόγηταί σου τὸ ὄνομα..."

530. "Εὐλογητὸς εἶ Κύριε..."

531. "ηὐλόγηταί σου τὸ ὄνομα"

532. Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα*

astery of Ivērōn, which preserves, as it seems, "For blessed is your name..." in its original position (after the evlogētaria), provides "For yours is the dominion..."[533] for the first stasis in imitation of the exclamation of the second antiphon of the Divine Liturgy. For the same reason, the same Typikon provides the exclamation of the third antiphon of the Divine Liturgy, "For you are a good God who loves humankind...,"[534] at the end of the second stasis. In contrast, the Typikon of Saint Sabas, the Triōdia, and all the printed editions follow another tradition. They place an unusual exclamation at the second stasis, "Ὅτι ἅγιος εἶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης τῶν χερουβὶμ ἐπαναπαυόμενος..." (For you our God are holy, who rests upon the throne of the glory of the Cherubim...), perhaps being attracted to the participle "ἐπαναπαυόμενος" (who rests upon) and to the relationship of its exclamation with the beloved themes of the hymnography of Great Saturday and the lamentations themselves (compare "The heavenly ones and the ones under the earth, perceiving you above on the throne...,"[535] the Cherubim, the angelic powers, and so forth).[536]

At the end of the third stasis, a synaptē did not take place and, consequently, nor did an exclamation. This is because immediately after the amōmos the chanting of the evlogētaria (resurrectional or funereal) always follow, which are inseparably associated with it and constitute a form of its stichēra. The twelfth verse of the amōmos ("Blessed are you, O Lord...")[537] is chanted before the amōmos and evlogētaria, and to this verse, these troparia also owe their name. This is expressly attested to by the Typikon of Saint Sabas, by the Slavic Typikon, and by the manuscripts: "After the end of the amōmos, we

(Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012), 345.

533. "Ὅτι σὸν τὸ κράτος..."

534. "Ὅτι ἀγαθὸς καὶ φιλάνθρωπος Θεός..."

535. "Ἄνω σε ἐν θρόνῳ, καὶ κάτω ἐν τάφῳ, τὰ ὑπερκόσμια, καὶ ὑποχθόνια, κατανοοῦντα..."

536. Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012), 345.

537. "Εὐλογητὸς εἶ Κύριε..."

do not say, 'Glory, both now,' but immediately the resurrectional troparia [or the troparia of the amōmos], plagal of the first tone, 'The company of the angels,'"[538] and "and after the end of this [of the third stasis] immediately the evlogētaria," "and immediately [after the third stasis] the resurrectional troparia." It is also attested to by the Triōdion: "And immediately the resurrectional evlogētaria in plagal of the first tone." However, the Triōdion has "Glory both now" at the two final troparia of the third stasis of the stichologia of the amōmos. Thus, the amōmos and its lamentations acquire some independence from the evlogētaria, a thing that facilitates the mediocre solutions that we will see below.

After the unit of the third stasis/lamentations, as we saw, "immediately" (εὐθύς or εὐθέως), namely, without a synaptē and exclamation being inserted, the resurrectional evlogētaria followed, and after them, the chanting concluded, as usual, with the small synaptē, the exclamation, and the kathismata ("In a clean linen and with divine spices...,"[539] "The choirs of the angels were awestruck..."[540]). What exclamation was said here? According to the taxis of Sunday Matins, the exclamation, "For blessed is your name...," usually ought to follow, which is encountered, just as we saw, in the codex of Ivērōn and which is also said in the corresponding case of the Saturday of Lazarus. However, according to the prevailing taxis of the Typikon of Saint Sabas, this had already been transferred to the end of the first stasis of the amōmos. Thus, here, the exclamation, "For you are the king of peace and savior of our souls...,"[541] is chosen. Can we assume that it had been attracted to the last lamentation of the third stasis, "Peace to the Church, salvation to your people...,"[542] with which the relationship of this exclamation is so manifest (see "peace" — "king of peace," "salvation" — "and savior of our souls")[543]? Perhaps this is the only possible explanation, indeed if we take under

538. "Τῶν ἀγγέλων ὁ δῆμος."
539. "Σινδόνι καθαρᾷ καὶ ἀρώμασι θείοις..."
540. "Ἐξέστησαν χοροί, τῶν Ἀγγέλων..."
541. "Σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ Βασιλεὺς τῆς εἰρήνης καὶ σωτὴρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν..."
542. "Εἰρήνην Ἐκκλησίᾳ λαῷ σου σωτηρίαν..."
543. "εἰρήνην"—"βασιλεὺς τῆς εἰρήνης," "σωτηρίαν"—"καὶ σωτὴρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν."

consideration that the two present-day troparia of the lamentations at "Glory both now" ("O Trinity, my God..."[544] and "To see the Resurrection of your son..."[545]), must have not existed, since, as we said, the stasis did not conclude with the "Glory both now." However, this exclamation was thus also duplicated, a matter that must not have been especially distressing, if we judge from the previously existing examples that we referenced.

It remains now for us to see how from its original position (after the evlogētaria), the exclamation at issue was found preceding the evlogētaria, at the end of the third stasis of the amōmos—lamentations, or before and after the evlogētaria of the Triōdion published by "Phōs" publications.

With the full development of the service, as it appears in the printed Triōdia, the lamentations had amounted to a large number of 185 troparia (first stasis 75, second 62, third 48) and a verse of the amōmos was chanted prior to each one. Despite the love that the people bore for these hymns, so touching, relatively easy to chant, and usually simple in content and easy to remember, their chanting began to become onerous by reason of precisely the length of the chanting. Even in many monasteries, they found a solution by oikonomia, which is attested to by their modern Typika and which is implemented in practice also nowadays: The lamentations were detached from their natural liturgical framework, the amōmos, which they had as a purpose to adorn, and are chanted altogether without verses. The amōmos is read completely before them. In parishes, only the lamentations remained, but these were and are chanted selectively, skillfully, but much less than what each stasis provides for.

However, the parish Typika proceeded also to another arrangement, apparently during the past century,[546] according to the model of the transfer of the taxis for the eōthinon gospel in Sunday Matins. Since the people did not come so early to church and the lamentations were preeminently a popular element, they transferred them together with the evlogētaria from their original position, which was

544. "Ὦ Τριὰς Θεέ μου..."
545. "Ἰδεῖν τὴν τοῦ υἱοῦ σου..."
546. The nineteenth century.

immediately after "God is the Lord" and the apolytikia, to a time more convenient for many. They put the canon first and transferred the lamentations between the katabasia of the end of the ninth ode, and the synaptē and exclamation, "For all the powers of the heavens praise you...,"[547] which introduces the chanting of lauds. We find this taxis in the modern Typika of Kōnstantinos and Violakēs and in the printed ancillary books for Great Week. This taxis is presently observed in our parish temples.

Certainly, the intention was good, given that it had in view the people's convenience, but I do not know whether its implementation in practice can be characterized as successful. This is especially apparent in the exclamations that constitute together with the synaptes, in some way, the backbone upon which a service is constructed. When transferring the lamentations and the evlogētaria, they paradoxically left behind the kathismata that followed the stichologia of the amōmos ("In a clean linen and with divine spices...,"[548] "The choirs of the angels were awestruck..."[549]) and whose exclamation, "For blessed is your name...,"[550] originally preceded, and, after its transfer to the first stasis of the lamentations, the newer exclamation, "For you are the king of peace...."[551] Thus, they introduce a new exclamation, "For yours is the dominion...,"[552] the exclamation after the first stichologia of Matins, which had no place during Great Saturday (as well as during Great Thursday and Pascha), where the stichologia of the Psalter is absent. Moreover, in order for them to preserve the exclamation, "For you are the king of peace...," which was found after the evlogētaria and would now collide with the ex-

547. "Ὅτι σὲ αἰνοῦσι πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν..."

548. "Σινδόνι καθαρᾷ..." The full kathisma is "Σινδόνι καθαρᾷ καὶ ἀρώμασι θείοις, τὸ Σῶμα τὸ σεπτόν, ἐξαιτήσας Πιλάτῳ, μυρίζει καὶ τίθησιν, Ἰωσὴφ καινῷ μνήματι· ὅθεν ὄρθριαι, αἱ μυροφόροι γυναῖκες, ἀνεβόησαν· Δεῖξον ἡμῖν ὡς προεῖπας, Χριστὲ τὴν Ἀνάστασιν."

549. "Ἐξέστησαν χοροί..." The full kathisma is "Ἐξέστησαν χοροί, τῶν Ἀγγέλων ὁρῶντες, τὸν ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Πατρός, καθεζόμενον κόλποις, πῶς τάφῳ κατατίθεται, ὡς νεκρὸς ὁ ἀθάνατος· ὃν τὰ τάγματα, τὰ τῶν Ἀγγέλων κυκλοῦσι· καὶ δοξάζουσι, σὺν τοῖς νεκροῖς ἐν τῷ Ἅδῃ, ὡς Κτίστην καὶ Κύριον."

550. "Ὅτι εὐλόγηταί σου τὸ ὄνομα..."

551. "Σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ Βασιλεὺς τῆς εἰρήνης καὶ σωτὴρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν..."

552. "Ὅτι σὸν τὸ κράτος..."

clamation before lauds ("For all the powers of the heavens praise you..."),[553] and in order not to eliminate it completely, as would have been more preferable, they transfer it to the end of the third stasis of the lamentations, which had already been made independent with the addition of "Glory both now" at their end. Thus, in a case unique to liturgical taxis, the unity of the amōmos and evlogētaria is broken with this synaptē and exclamation.

From the above, the case of the double (namely, the triple) repetition of the exclamation, "For you are the king of peace..." in the Triōdion of the publisher (Phōs) is also explained. The editor of the edition attempted, certainly without success, to reconcile both traditions: of the Triōdia, which had it after the evlogētaria, and the modern Typika and ancillary books, which had it after the third stasis of the lamentations. And this edition repeated it two times.

Let us note in concluding our retrospection into the development of the Matins of Great Saturday, a both interesting and even curious variant of this service, which we find in a monastic Typikon (*Codex Philotheou 153* from the sixteenth century), a precursor, we would say, to the later parish arrangements. The rubric is entitled, "Just as it is arranged nowadays on Holy and Great Saturday."[554] The amōmos and the lamentations are transferred to a strange place, between "Extend your mercy to those who know you"[555] of the great doxology and the trisagion. Each stasis of the amōmos—megalynaria, namely of the lamentations—concludes with "Glory both now," a synaptē follows, during which the priest censes, and exclaims, for the first stasis, "For blessed is your name...," for the second, "Through the good will and goodness..."[556] and for the third, "Through the grace, compassion...."[557] The resurrectional evlogētaria follow and immediately the "asmatic" trisagion is chanted, during which the priest "lifts up the holy Gospel book on his right shoulder and covers it with a veil." He enters inside the temple and places it, as usual, on

553. "Ὅτι σὲ αἰνοῦσι..."
554. "Ὡς καθὼς πολιτεύεται τὴν σήμερον τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ μεγάλῳ Σαββάτῳ."
555. "Παράτεινον τὸ ἔλεός σου τοῖς γινώσκουσί σε."
556. "Εὐδοκίᾳ καὶ ἀγαθότητι..."
557. "Χάριτι καὶ οἰκτιρμοῖς..."

the holy table during the chanting of the troparion "The noble Joseph having taken your most pure body down from the tree and wrapped it in pure linen and covered it with spices, laid it in a new tomb."[558]

Conclusion: The taxis of the Triōdion in relation to the rubric[559] for the entire service of Matins of Great Saturday and in relation to the exclamations is certainly the most correct and this must be observed without fail in the monasteries. The modern Typika, in their effort to accommodate the faithful, caused a confusion in the taxis and inflicted mediocre liturgical solutions. These solutions were implemented in the parishes, always with the hope that someday these apparent faults would benefit from some serious and responsible correction. Fortunately, they concern solely the details of our liturgical practice.

## 439

**Why during the Vespers of Great Saturday is a prokeimenon not chanted after "O Gladsome Light?"[560]**

## 440

**Does the deacon say "Evening"[561] after the entrance of the Vespers of Great Saturday and before the readings, or not?**

## 441

**During the Vespers of the feasts of the Nativity and Theophany, is the prokeimenon of the day said before the many readings or is it omitted?**

---

558. "Ὁ εὐσχήμων Ἰωσήφ, ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου καθελών, τὸ ἄχραντόν σου Σῶμα, σινδόνι καθαρᾷ εἱλήσας καὶ ἀρώμασιν, ἐν μνήματι καινῷ κηδεύσας ἀπέθετο." Translation based on Holy Trinity Monastery, *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Among the Saints John Chrysostom: Slavonic-English Parallel* Text, fourth edition (Jordanville, NY: Printshop of Saint Job of Pochaev, 2015), 147.

559. διάταξις.

560. "Φῶς ἱλαρόν."

561. "Ἑσπέρας."

According to the printed Triōdia and the Typika of Kōnstantinos[562] and Violakēs,[563] during the Vespers of Great Saturday after "O Gladsome Light" a prokeimenon is not said, but "immediately the readings." The Typikon of Saint Sabas is more detailed: "O Gladsome Light. We do not say a prokeimenon, but immediately, 'Wisdom,' and the reader begins the readings."[564]

This case of Great Saturday, without a prokeimenon of Vespers, could be characterized as unique. As is well known, during Vespers after "O Gladsome Light" either the prokeimena of the day, the great prokeimena, "Alleluia," or the special prokeimena of the weekdays of Great Lent (which are read nowadays) are always chanted. The Vespers of Great Saturday and the Vespers of the Nativity and Theophany alone constitute an exception. However, since the service of these two last feasts follows the pattern of the Vespers of Great Saturday, according to which they are structured and by which they are influenced, in essence we have only the unique instance of Great Saturday and, naturally, also, its imitations. For this reason, the above-noted Typika and the corresponding Mēnaia (December and January) also do not provide for the chanting of a prokeimenon in the Vespers of the Nativity and Theophany but note: "'O Gladsome Light' and the readings according to their taxis," or "'O Gladsome Light.' Next, the readings" (Typikon of Saint Sabas), "and immediately the first reading" (Typikon of Kōnstantinos, December 25), "next the readings," "and immediately the readings" (Mēnaia), or "next they recite the readings" or "and at once readings" (Typikon of Kōnstantinos, January 6).[565]

---

562. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 240.

563. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 364.

564. Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012), 346.

565. Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ,

The comparative examination of these three parallel instances can better assist in the pursuit of an answer to our questions.

The same Typikon of Kōnstantinos gives us the first reason to possibly question the correctness of these standard rubrics of our printed Typika in use. In the case of a coincidence of the Nativity feast with a Sunday, during the Vespers of Saturday, it provides, in its second edition: "'O Gladsome Light.' Prokeimenon: 'The Lord reigned,'[566] then the readings" (seventh printing, second edition, in Constantinople 1874, p. 67), while in the similar case of Theophany it prescribes that after "O Gladsome Light," "next they recite the readings" (p. 82).[567] Conversely, in its first edition, it prescribes precisely the reverse for the above cases: While in the Vespers of the Nativity "'O Gladsome Light' and immediately the readings," yet in the Vespers of Theophany "'O Gladsome Light' Prokeimenon: 'The Lord reigned,' the first reading" (in Athens 1842, pp. 52, 59).[568] Can we assume that this is a mistake? This would be very possible if the manuscript tradition also confirmed it. However, we shall see below that the tradition testifies to completely the opposite. Thus, the evidence of the Typikon of Kōnstantinos shows itself useful because it indicates that there exists a standard problem, to which the compiler of the Typikon attempted to give, without success, an interim solution. According to the Typikon of Violakēs, the practice has already firmly turned in favor of the prokeimenon's omission both on the three feasts and on all their individual cases.

We also discover roughly the same fluid transient situation in the late manuscript Typika of the Holy Mountain. Thus, the *Typikon or Notes on the Typikon* of the hieromonk Methodios (1890)

---

2012), 145, 162; Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 62, 82, 84.

566. "Ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν..."

567. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 67, 82.

568. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed. (Ἀθῆναι: Ν.Δ. Φορμάνος, 1842), 52, 59. The first quote more precisely states, "Φῶς ἱλαρόν, καὶ εὐθύς, Γενέσεως τὸ Ἀνάγνωσμα, καὶ λέγεται τὸ ά. Ἀνάγνωσμα."

notes regarding the Vespers of the Nativity, "A prokeimenon of the day has no place, but immediately after 'O Gladsome Light' the readings according to the taxis"; for the Vespers of Theophany, "it does not have a prokeimenon for Vespers"; and for Great Saturday, "it does not have a prokeimenon." However, if the Nativity and Theophany happen on a Sunday, during the Vespers (Saturday Vespers) he provides for the prokeimenon, "The Lord reigned."[569] The Typikon of the Monastery of Dionysiou for Great Saturday, "We do not say a prokeimenon [because the prokeimenon is chanted after the reading of the epistle]." For the Nativity and Theophany, "'O Gladsome Light' chanted,[570] the prokeimenon of the day and the readings for the feast." The Typikon of the Monastery of Hagiou Pavlou for Great Saturday, "A prokeimenon of course is not said, but the deacon immediately cries aloud, 'Wisdom,' but the reader exclaims, 'The reading of Genesis…'"; for the Nativity, "A prokeimenon is not said, but immediately the readings"; and for the feast of Lights the same thing, but another hand crosses it out and adds: "it is said during Saturday Vespers."

The Typikon of the Monastery of Xēropotamou for Great Saturday notes: "'O Gladsome Light' and immediately, 'Wisdom,' and we begin the readings. Because we do not say a prokeimenon," for Theophany, "'O Gladsome Light' and the readings as they are written in the Mēnaia." However, for the Nativity, it is more detailed and illuminating: "While the manuscript Typikon records the prokeimenon of the day, yet the Typikon of the Great Church says that

569. Μεθόδιος Ἱερομόναχος Σιμωνοπετρίτης ὁ Ἡλιοπολίτης, *Τυπικὸν ἢ Τυπικαὶ Σημειώσεις* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἔκδοσις Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σίμωνος Πέτρας, 2016), 107 (Vespers of the Nativity, 124 (Vespers of Theophany), 361 (Great Saturday), 109 (if Nativity on Sunday), and 126 (if Theophany on Sunday). Methodios (1841–1917 or 1920), a hieromonk of Mount Athos, was born in Aydin (Τράλλεις/Ἡλιούπολις, Asia Minor), was tonsured a monk in 1862 at the Monastery of Simōnos Petras on the Holy Mountain, served as the Secretary for the Sacred Community, resided in the kalyvē of the Transfiguration in the Skete of Kavsokalyvia, lived in a hermitage located in the area of Kerasia, and eventually spent his remaining life in the cave of Saint Athanasios (d. ca. 1003) near the Monastery of the Great Lavra. He was also active in the composition of hymnography. His work on the Typikon was produced in 1890.

570. "μετὰ μέλους."

immediately after 'O Gladsome Light' the canonarch does the first reading, which also one must prefer for the reason that the verses that the canonarch intones while standing in the middle of the temple, when the end of the troparia for the prophecies is chanted by the chanters, replace the prokeimenon of the day." Therefore, there was an issue regarding the prokeimenon, as most of the above Typika attest, for at least the cases of two feasts, the Nativity and Theophany. The older and more conservative Typika, such as that of Dionysiou, provided for the prokeimenon of the day, and naturally, the resurrectional one for the Vespers of Saturday, "The Lord reigned." Others considered the prokeimena of the weekdays incompatible, but retained the prokeimenon of Saturday, "The Lord reigned," obviously for its joyous character or for the special honor of Sunday (Typikon of Xēropotamou and correction to the Typikon of Hagiou Pavlou; compare also the Typikon of Kōnstantinos). The rationale cited by the Typikon of Xēropotamou demonstrates that the modern practice of omitting the prokeimenon required a defense. It considers that the psalms (which are recited between the readings during the chanting of the troparia for the prophecies) substitute for it. But also, regarding Great Saturday, the more conservative Typikon of the Monastery of Dionysiou attempts to find a justification. It identifies the prokeimenon of Vespers as "Arise, O God...,"[571] which is chanted instead of the allēlouarion between the epistle and gospel. This indirect witness is very significant, as will be shown from research into the more ancient sources.

Regarding the prokeimenon of Great Saturday, the witnesses that we have date back to the seventh century. The Jerusalemite–Georgian Kanonarion has a double prokeimenon in the Vespers of Great Saturday, "Praise, O Jerusalem, the Lord..."[572] (Ps 147:1) and "Arise, O God..."[573] (Psalm 81:8) with its verses. The Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople from the tenth century has, "Let all

571. "Ἀνάστα, ὁ Θεός..."
572. "Ἐπαίνει Ἰερουσαλὴμ τὸν Κύριον..."
573. "Ἀνάστα, ὁ Θεός..."

the earth worship you…"[574] (Ps 65:4).[575] The same thing is the case also for the Typikon of the Monastery of the Savior in Messina from the year 1131, the Kanonarion of the *Codex Sinai 150* from tenth–eleventh centuries, and the Typikon of the Monastery of the Most-Holy Theotokos "τοῦ Μῆλι" of the *Codex Vatican 1877* from the year 1292.[576] The Typikon of the Monastery of the Evergetis (*Codex Athens 788* of the twelfth century) prescribes another prokeimenon, "The Lord reigned…"[577] (Ps 92:1).[578]

Regarding the Nativity and Theophany, the evidence is scarce and not in agreement. The Typikon of the Evergetis provides for the prokeimenon of the day, and that of the Savior in Messina, the "Lord reigned…" for whatever day it happens.[579] The Typikon of Saint Sophia provides somewhat confused evidence; for the Vespers of the Nativity, the manuscript of *Timiou Staurou 40* states simply, "the prokeimenon is said,"[580] which the codices of *Patmos*

574. "Πᾶσα ἡ γῆ προσκυνησάτωσάν σοι…"

575. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:84.

576. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 244; Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, 1:882. The name, "τοῦ Μῆλι," also spelled "τοῦ Μίλι" (Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, 1:836) may refer to Mili San Pietro, a village near the city of Messina, where a former eleventh century Basilian monastery and church dedicated to the Virgin Mary are located. There is a description of the site in a publication of the Italian Ministero per I Beni e le Attività Culturali, "Chiesa di Santa Maria Mili San Pietro." Online: http://iccdold.beniculturali.it/medioevosiciliano/brochure/scheda_26.pdf (accessed: June 25, 2022). For a discussion of the architecture and basic studies of the monastery, see Charles E. Nicklies, "Builders, Patrons, and Identity: The Domed Basilicas of Sicily and Calabria," *Gesta* 43 (2004): 99–114.

577. "Ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν…"

578. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 500–501.

579. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, September to February*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.5 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2000), 330–331; Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 80, 96.

580. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:152.

*460* and *Paris 1590* specify as "The Lord reigned...." Regarding Theophany, it states nothing relevant. Finally, the Kanonarion of *Sinai 150* has special prokeimena for the Nativity, "The Lord spoke to me..."[581] (Ps 2:7) and for Theophany, "The waters saw you, O God..."[582] (Ps 76:17).

From this entire retrospection, we can, I think, come to certain conclusions. It appears that originally in the Vespers of the Nativity and Theophany the prokeimena of the day were chanted. However, since the penitential prokeimena of the weekdays were judged perhaps incompatible for these great feasts of the Lord (see the Typikon of Methodios: "has no place"[583]), they preferred, obviously under the influence of Great Saturday, "The Lord reigned...." For the same reasons, they also selected prokeimena that were special and more suited to the themes of these feasts, such as those that are attested to by the *Codex Sinai 150*, but the dissemination of which must have been limited. For the same reasons, during Great Saturday, the resurrectional prokeimenon, "The Lord reigned...," was originally chanted and, afterwards, the festive prokeimenon par excellence, "Let all the earth worship you...," or in Jerusalem, "Praise, O Jerusalem, the Lord..." in combination with "Arise, O God...."

However, already the more dominant prokeimena for each feast and their psalms were recited between the readings during the chanting of the troparia for the prophecies: Psalm 92 ("The Lord reigned...") between the sixth and seventh reading of the Nativity and Theophany. Psalm 2 ("Why did the nations grow insolent... The Lord spoke to me...")[584] was the prokeimenon of the epistle of the Nativity. Psalm 81 ("God stood in a gathering of gods...Arise, O God...")[585] instead of the allēlouarion of Great Saturday. Finally, Psalm 65 ("Make a joyful noise to God, all the earth...Let all the

581. "Κύριος εἶπε πρός με..."
582. "Εἶδοσάν σε ὕδατα, ὁ Θεός..."
583. Μεθόδιος Ἱερομόναχος Σιμωνοπετρίτης ὁ Ἡλιοπολίτης, *Τυπικὸν ἢ Τυπικαὶ Σημειώσεις* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἔκδοσις Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σίμωνος Πέτρας, 2016), 107.
584. "Ἵνα τί ἐφρύαξαν ἔθνη... Κύριος εἶπε πρός με..."
585. "Ὁ Θεὸς ἔστη ἐν συναγωγῇ θεῶν... Ἀνάστα ὁ Θεός..."

earth do obeisance to you…")[586] as a prokeimenon of the epistle of Great Saturday.

This certainly gave rise to confusion, the effects of which are visible in the modern Typika. The prokeimena after "O Gladsome Light" of Vespers for the three feasts were considered as a type of duplication of the psalms that already were recited with stichologia between the readings with the troparia of the prophecy, or as prokeimena of the epistle or in place of the allēlouarion. Thus, the already existing psalms between the readings were considered prokeimena for Vespers. The Typika of Dionysiou and Violakēs characterize "Arise, O God…" as a prokeimenon of Great Saturday and invoke it in order for them to justify the omission of the prokeimenon for Vespers of Great Saturday, which also appears to be the one chronologically older. It is very possible that the rubrics of the Typika originated in this manner, where after "O Gladsome Light" they also prescribe, "immediately the readings," on all three feasts.

Worthy of special mention are the rubrics of the Slavonic Typikon. On the one hand, these display a particularity that we do not encounter in the ancient and modern Typika, but on the other hand a characteristic archaic form and preciseness, especially in the Vespers of the Nativity and Theophany. Thus, in the Vespers of these two feasts, the prokeimenon of the day is chanted, with only the following difference: If the Vespers is celebrated the evening of Friday (namely, if the Nativity or the feast of Lights is Saturday), instead of the prokeimenon for the day ("God is my helper…)[587] the great prokeimenon, "Who is so great as our God…"[588] (Ps 76:14–15) and "Our God in heaven…"[589] (Ps 113:11) are chanted respectively, and this takes place because during the Vespers for Saturday "The Lord reigned…" is always chanted. Consequently, the great prokeimenon of Vespers for the day of the feast, which coincides in this case with a Sunday, is transferred to the eve. During Great Saturday, a prokei-

586. "Ἀλαλάξατε τῷ Κυρίῳ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ… Πᾶσα ἡ γῆ προσκυνησάτωσάν σοι…"
587. "Ὁ Θεὸς, ἀντιλήπτωρ μου, εἶ…"
588. "Τίς Θεὸς μέγας…"
589. "Ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ…"

menon is not said, but after "O Gladsome Light," immediately "'Wisdom' and straightway the readings."

We come now to the topic that the second question poses. Given that the retrospection into the ancient practice demonstrated that there also existed a prokeimenon in the three instances, consequently the deacon, by custom, would say "Evening,"[590] as in the Vespers services of Great Lent and as also is done during the corresponding Vespers of Great Thursday, or "The evening prokeimenon,"[591] as done in other Vespers. Now, since it became prevalent that a prokeimenon not be said, this interjection of the deacon is for no reason. Moreover, this is why it is also not attested to by the printed editions. If this is done by chance, it is due rather to a deviation or an attraction to the practice of the other Vespers of Great Lent. And because it is unlikely that the modern practice preserves the memory of the prokeimenon, which formerly was there. When the practice inclined towards the omission of the prokeimenon, for the reasons that we saw, some Typika correctly prescribe "the deacon immediately cries aloud 'Wisdom'" (Hagiou Pavlou), or "and immediately 'Wisdom'" (Saint Sabas, Slavonic, Xēropotamou), precisely because this diaconal exhortation introduces the reading of the prophecies. This is fitting to be said even nowadays, inasmuch as the prokeimenon is omitted. If ever it is restored, and I think that the ancient practice teaches that this is correct, then the diaconal "Evening" would have a rationale.

## 442

**There exists a custom that a funeral is not done on Great Friday, since on this day the burial of Christ took place. Does this custom have a basis? Is it permitted or not permitted for a funeral service to be celebrated and, if yes, where will it be celebrated?**

The funeral service is always done as need dictates, namely, even also on Great Friday. If a pertinent proscriptive rubric existed, it would exist for joyous days, at least for Pascha, but it is not possible for

590. "Ἑσπέρας."
591. "Ἑσπέρας προκείμενον."

it to exist. Death comes on an unspecified day and hour, and the extension of the delay for unburied dead is impossible, especially in a summer period and warm climates. In large cities, the technical capabilities exist nowadays that permit the postponement of burial for a convenient time. Thus, the burial might not take place on Great Friday, not so much because custom prohibits it, but for practical reasons, namely, the day's long service, the epitaphios, and so forth.[592] Usually, from what I know, for these reasons, if the funeral service occurs on Great Friday, it is celebrated during the afternoon either in the cemetery temple,[593] in a chapel, in one of the side aisles of the temple, or even in the narthēx, if it is spacious and suitable.

There are proscriptive rubrics that pertain not to the celebration of the funeral service, which as we saw cannot be postponed, but to the memorial services. However, concerning this topic, we have special questions and will examine it in another answer.[594]

## 443

**In the funeral service, some troparia are found in a plural number and others in the singular, for example, "τοῖς μεταστᾶσι" (for the departed ones) – "τῷ μεταστάντι" (for the departed one). In general, everything is in the male gender. How must they be chanted when we have, as usual, one who has "fallen asleep" or when this one is a woman? Should we chant them in a singular number and in a female gender, as applicable, or do we leave things as they are?**

In the answer to question 374, we spoke regarding a similar problem, which arises in the service of holy baptism. There, we also noted the pertinent difficulty, since around ninety words require modification to the female gender when the baby is a girl. In the funeral service, the difficulty is greater from one point of view because most modifi-

592. Phountoulēs is most likely also referring to the koubouklion that is usually brought out onto the solea on Thursday night, after the matins service for Great Friday, and thus presents a temporary physical barrier of sorts to placing the coffin with the deceased in the same location.

593. In Greece, most cemeteries also have a small temple.

594. See question 489.

cations concern troparia that are chanted by the chanters. In general, they do not have either the education, or the experience in liturgical texts that priests have, to whom the gender changes for the prayers of holy baptism exclusively are of concern. Moreover, when by the change to the female gender, an additional syllable to a word is added (for example, φροντίζων, "taking thought for" – φροντίζουσα, "taking thought for"), while this is painless for reading, it creates a small problem for chanting.

However, regarding other aspects of the funeral service, in comparison with the service of holy baptism, matters are simpler. First of all, the condensed form with which it became prevalent for the funeral service to be celebrated in our parish temples (verses chosen from the amōmos,[595] funereal evlogētaria, kontakion, idiomela, readings, the usual diakonika, the prayer "O God of spirits...,"[596] and a stichēron of the kiss), leaves very little room for gender inflection changes. I roughly counted around thirty such instances in the above texts (diakonika, prayer, and troparia), here indeed most relate to easy and stereotypical phrases, which are often repeated: "τοῦ δούλου"–"τῆς δούλης" (of the servant), "τὸν δοῦλον"–"τὴν δούλην" (the servant), "τοῦ κεκοιμημένου δούλου"–"τῆς κεκοιμημένης δούλης" (of the servant who has "fallen asleep"), "τὸν κεκοιμημένον δοῦλον"–"τὴν κεκοιμημένην δούλην" (the servant who has "fallen asleep"), "τῷ μεταστάντι"–"τῇ μεταστάσῃ" (for/to the departed), "τὸν μεταστάντα"–"τὴν μεταστᾶσαν" (the departed), "αὐτοῦ"–" αὐτῆς" (his/her), "αὐτόν"–"αὐτήν" (him/her), "ὅν"–"ἥν" (whom). Indeed, in some printed editions, but not in all, provision has been also made after each word and phrase for its corresponding form in the female gender to appear within parentheses, but not in all.

The relatively more difficult elements are found concentrated in the first stichēron of the kiss, "Δεῦτε τελευταῖον ἀσπασμόν..." (O come let us give a last kiss...): "τῷ θανόντι (to the deceased) ... οὗτος (he) ... φροντίζων (taking thought for) ... ὅνπερ (him)...," "τῇ θανούσῃ (to the deceased) ... αὕτη (she) ... φροντίζουσα (taking thought for) ... ἥνπερ (her)."

595. Psalm 118.

596. "Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων..."

The difficulties would be certainly greater if they also chanted the canon. This is perhaps the reason that in a few manuscripts, there exists another "funereal canon for a woman who fell asleep" in these instances. As for the Beatitudes, which are said in a few regions, gender changes are required only for the second and third troparia, where here also they are simple, just as the preceding ones: "ὅν"–"ἥν" (whom), "βοῶντα"–"βοῶσαν" (crying), "ὅν…δοῦλον"–"ἥν…δούλην" (who…servant).[597]

Finally, regarding the plural number that is encountered in a few idiomela—but not in all printed editions—this is explained by the fact that these are taken from the Paraklētikē's service for Saturday, where it is natural that they are found in a plural number since they concern all those "fallen asleep."

However, I think that it would not be difficult in a forthcoming printed edition of the funeral service for the change in a female gender of the various grammatical forms to be placed within parentheses in all instances. This would facilitate the service's celebration, and mixed forms or barbarisms would not be heard hereafter, which are unfortunately not unusual, especially during the chanting of the stichēra of the kiss.

## 444

**Is the reading of the gospel by a layman permitted when the priest has a problem of eye disease?**

I do not doubt that the case the question presents is real, but it is very rare. If a priest cannot see to read the gospel, then how can he serve, read the prayers, offer holy communion, and consume the Holy Elements?

---

597. These adjustments refer to the troparia that are inserted after the last six Beatitudes in addition to "Glory…" and "Both now…." The text of the Beatitudes and associated troparia may be found in *Ἐξοδιαστικόν, περιέχον ἁπάσας τὰς Νεκωσίμους Ἀκολουθίας καὶ τὰ Μνημόσυνα, Ὡς καὶ διαφόρους συγχωρητικὰς εὐχάς*, vol. 3 of *Εὐχολόγιον*, ed. Ἱερὰ Μονὴ Σίμωνος Πέτρας (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἐκδοσις Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Σίμωνος Πέτρας, 2009), 160–162.

However, let us discuss this somewhat unlikely case. Naturally, we cannot find an answer in the Church's tradition. The gospel is always read by the hierarch, the priest, or the deacon. Never by lower clergy (subdeacon, readers, chanters, and so forth) or by laity. What takes place in a few temples during the Vespers of Love, namely that the gospel pericope "On the evening..."[598] is read in different languages by the laity, is not an example for imitation. The same thing also applies to the unique (as I think) case—but very practical—for the teacher[599] to read the kneeling prayers of Pentecost, because the priest found himself unable.

We would say that since the priest of the question has such a strong memory that he says the prayers by heart, he could also say a brief and well-known gospel pericope, such as for example, the two gospels of the Mother of God, "Mary arose..."[600] and "Jesus entered into a village...,"[601] or the gospel of the Hagiasmos, "Jesus went up to Jerusalem...,"[602] which many priests know inside out. As far as the gospel pericope of the day or of the feast, in order that the people not be deprived of its hearing, let it be read simply in a reading style even by a layman from the analogion in place of the sermon, certainly without the elements of introduction, "Wisdom, arise," and so forth, which mistakenly, I think, are also said during the repetition of the gospel for the Vespers of Pascha in different languages.[603]

As an answer to a rare case, these are matters of my personal opinion.

---

598. John 20:19–25.

599. Most likely, this refers to village life during an earlier period in Greece, where often the priest and schoolteacher were the only persons who were literate and were also viewed with high esteem as leaders of the community.

600. Luke 1:39–49, 56.

601. Luke 10:38–42, 11:27–28.

602. John 5:1–4.

603. See question 579.

## 445

**Why during the enarxis of the Presanctified (Vespers) do we say, "Blessed is the kingdom...,"[604] given that this is not a standard Divine Liturgy or a mystery?**

Repeatedly in preceding answers, we have referred to the existence of two types of daily services, which were in use at the same time in our Church up until the thirteenth century, even partially until the fifteenth. There is the parish, secular type, basically Antiochian, which they observed in parish temples, and the monastic, for monks or Jerusalemite, which from the Monastery of Saint Sabas had spread and become dominant in the monasteries.[605] Eventually, for different reasons, the latter one became prevalent everywhere, after it received quite a few elements from the former. It is observed even up until nowadays in monasteries and in our parish temples, with more than a few, as a result, modifications or rather abridgments and omissions of services, "on account of those in the world not having the strength to perform everything," as Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki aptly observes (*Dialogue*, chapters 302–303).[606] The services of Vespers, Compline, Midnight Office, Matins, and Hours, which we perform nowadays in our parishes, are monastic. The services of the mysteries, namely, the Divine Liturgy, baptism, marriage, and so forth, remained in their old "asmatic"/parish form. However, some of them were influenced by the monastic practice, either because they were developed later in imitation of the monastic practice, or because they received additions, especially at their start, from parallel monastic services. For example, the service of unction, where its section before the litany of peace is a type of monastic Matins, the Small Hagiasmos, the funeral service for laity, and even the Divine Liturgy, when the typika are chanted instead of the antiphons, and so forth.

Especially now, the Presanctified in the form that it is performed nowadays constitutes a synthesis of monastic Vespers and the old

604. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία..."

605. See the beginning of question 67 and the discussion of the Typikon of Saint Sabas in the notes to question 401.

606. PG 155:556d.

parish service of communion of the Presanctified Precious Gifts, which follows the model of the corresponding part of the Divine Liturgy. In the manuscripts, we find even another form of Presanctified, which is associated not with the monastic, but with the "asmatic" Vespers. This is the type that they observed in the parishes before the dominance also in them of the monastic Typikon.

These two Typika—the parish and the monastic—differed in many elements. One of them is also the fact that the "asmatic" service began with "Blessed is the kingdom...," and the monastic, with "Blessed is our God...."[607] Namely, the fact that nowadays holy baptism, the Divine Liturgy, marriage, and even unction, as we saw in the answer to question 312, begin with "Blessed is the kingdom...," does not occur because they are services of mysteries, but because they are services of the old parish Typikon, according to which all the services began in the same manner. Namely, not only these, but also the daily parish services of Vespers, Matins, Trithektē, and the Pannychis (the "asmatic" Typikon alone had these)[608] began similarly with "Blessed is the kingdom...."

---

607. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν..."

608. In question 282, Phountoulēs provides the following discussion of the Pannychis:

> This is about the 'asmatic' service of the Pannychis (πανυχίς), which was celebrated in parish temples of the Byzantine empire before the prevalence of the monastic Jerusalemite service of Compline. It was originally celebrated on the evening of all days of the year. Its celebration was later limited only to great feasts, Great Lent, and Great Week. Finally, it was preserved in its penitential form for the first five days of the first week of the Fast. A remnant of this practice is the series of gospel pericopes that were preserved in our liturgical books in use, in the gospel readings, where also their reading was preserved in the monastic service of Compline in parallel to the Pannychis. The 'asmatic' Pannychis is not an all-night service, as its name might mislead us to assume [Note: In Greek, the term, 'πανυχίς,' is composed from the words, πᾶσα (all) and νύξ (night)], but a relatively short service, the celebration of which does not last more than one hour. In other words, the Pannychis was an evening service, which was celebrated after supper, as a kind of small vigil, a parish Compline, which also had quite a few things in common with the monastic Great Compline, such as Psalm 90, 'He who lives by the help of the Most High...,' (Ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν βοηθείᾳ τοῦ Ὑψίστου . . .), the hymn,

Thus, why now did the former start like this and the others start differently? Perhaps this does not even require a justification. Thus, it was their framework, structure. However, in the Fathers, we find certain commentaries, which are very interesting and quite satisfactory, because, even if they did not explain the cause for the existence of this difference, they give us its meaning and character. Thus, Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki considers "Blessed is our God..." as originating from the shadowy revelation of the Old Testament, in contrast to "Blessed is the Kingdom..." that springs forth from the knowledge of God in Trinity, which has been revealed in the New Testament: "We see more forcibly what has been typified of Christ's economy in the rightly called 'asmatic' service...[609] The priest standing before the holy table as before God's throne in heaven, blesses God in Trinity, not saying 'Blessed is our God.' For this is not the custom in the taxis of the asma (τοῦ ἄσματος),[610] because this is from the Old Testament alone. But just as in the Sacred Liturgy, when he theologizes the trinitarian God and the unity of the kingdom and nature, 'Blessed is the kingdom of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, always' is a proclamation of grace and the knowledge and confession of the only God in Trinity"[611] (*Dialogue*, chapters 345, 347). Saint Theodōros the Stoudite considers

---

'As a bodiless nature, the Cherubim...' (Ἡ ἀσώματος φύσις...), and so forth. Therefore, it was natural for the service that replaced the 'asmatic' Pannychis in the parishes to also preserve certain of its elements just as happened in this case with the gospel readings.

See also, Miguel Arranz, "Les prières presbytérales de la 'Pannychis' de l'ancien Euchologe byzantine et la 'Panikhida' des défunts," *OCP* 40 (1974): 314–343 and *OCP* 41 (1975): 119–139; and Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Ἀκολουθίαι τοῦ Νυχθημέρου*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 1' (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 45–82. For studies of the Trithektē, also known as the "τριτοέκτη," see: M. Arranz, "Les prières presbytérales de la Tritoekti de l'ancien Euchologe byzantin," *OCP* 43 (1977): 70–93, 335–354; Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Ἀκολουθίαι τοῦ Νυχθημέρου*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 1' (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 11–44.

609. PG 155:524b.

610. The "taxis of the asma" refers to the "asmatic" Typikon in general.

611. PG 155:554d–525a.

"Blessed is the kingdom" as "a trophy of victory and impartial[612] authority," but "Blessed is our God" as "a symbol of humility and inviolate supplication" (*Explanation of the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts*).[613]

From what we already wrote, the variance that is observed in the manuscripts as regards to the manner of the Presanctified's enarxis is easily explained. While those associated with the "asmatic" Vespers make its enarxis with "Blessed is the kingdom...," those that are derived from the monastic practice begin it with "Blessed is our God...," since the enarxis of Vespers precisely took place respectively in these two manners. For the same reason, Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki knows its enarxis with "Blessed is the kingdom...," since he precisely associates it with the "asmatic"/parish Vespers, as it was performed up until his days in Saint Sophia of Thessaloniki (*Dialogue*, chapter 353),[614] while Theodōros the Stoudite conversely attests regarding its enarxis with "Blessed is our God..." according to the monastic tradition: "Accordingly, the priest...stands before the holy table and, while censing crosswise, exclaims; he proclaims certainly not 'Blessed is the kingdom...,' but 'Blessed is our God'" (*Explanation of the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts*).[615]

But in many manuscripts, which have the monastic form of Vespers–Presanctified, the enarxis is still recorded with "Blessed is the kingdom...." This is easily explained. The Euchologia remained more conservative and more faithful to the "asmatic" form of service. The same thing also for the priests who when relying upon the Euchologia performed the monastic services of the Vespers and Matins but based on "asmatic" prescriptions. Thus, they were also saying the prayers of the "asmatic" antiphons for the respective services that they performed. However, since these did not exist for all

612. "ἀπροσωπολήπτου." This is translated "impartial" in the sense of without reference to status or rank (BDAG, 126), namely, "without respect of persons" (Lampe, s.v. "ἀπροσωπόληπτος").

613. PG 99:1688b–1688c. Saint Theodōros the Stoudite (759–826) was a major monastic figure and opponent of iconoclasm, who is attributed many works, including extensive hymnography.

614. PG 155:656a–657a.

615. PG 99:1688b.

the places in the monastic service, they said them inaudibly together with their exclamations gathered also at dead times, so to speak, for the priest. For this reason, all the prayers of the antiphons of the "asmatic" Lamp-lighting were gathered and said up until nowadays during the introductory psalm of the monastic Vespers and the prayers of the antiphons for the "asmatic" Matins, during the Six Psalms of the monastic Matins. According to the same manner, the "asmatic" manner of beginning Vespers–Presanctified invaded, dominated, and is in force up until nowadays also in the monastic Vespers–Presanctified that we celebrate today.

The same thing also precisely happened in the joining of the Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great with the monastic Vespers during Great Thursday, Great Saturday, and the eves of the Nativity and Theophany. These Vespers also begin with "Blessed is the kingdom..." instead of "Blessed is our God...," as would be more natural. The Divine Liturgy, whether as complete in the above cases or as a Presanctified, was in any case more powerful than monastic Vespers, and for this reason the "asmatic" manner of its enarxis, namely, "Blessed is the kingdom...," was preserved in both these forms.

At any rate, for many centuries, both traditions co-existed, and the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts began either in the one or the other manner, depending on the manuscript or the taxis that each priest followed. We can confirm this from the variations that even more late manuscripts present on this point. Certainly, one Diataxis of the Presanctified in the *Codex Athens 758* from the seventeenth century, not only recognizes the double practice, but also expressly mentions it: "Then he stands before the holy table, he makes three prostrations while saying, 'O God have mercy on me.' And he kisses the holy Gospel book and exclaims thus: 'Blessed is the kingdom....' One must know that in the monasteries also many others say: 'Blessed is our God.'" It is obvious that "Blessed is the kingdom..." became prevalent and was generalized with the spread and predominance of printed editions, which preferred the parish practice.

## 446

**In a case of need, is it possible for the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts to be celebrated with only a portion of the Holy Bread (lamb) or must it necessarily be whole?**

A case of need is not justified in the Presanctified. During the Liturgies of Saturday or of Sunday, the priest calculates precisely how many Presanctifieds are to be performed in the course of the week and, accordingly, excises, sanctifies, and preserves the required number of lambs in the artophorion. The Typika also note the number of regular Presanctifieds that are provided for. If the priest did not calculate well, I think that it is preferable for him not to celebrate the Presanctified.

And this is the case not because Christ is not found complete in every portion or even also in every sacred particle of the Holy Bread. Namely, not for dogmatic reasons, but for reasons of liturgical taxis, which are completely respected and in force. Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki precisely answers this in the fifty-eighth question of Metropolitan Gabriēl of Pentapolis, "In the Liturgy of the Presanctified, must one offer a portion of the Divine Bread or the whole?" The Saint then writes: "The Bread also ought not to be a portion, but complete, so that it might be cut into pieces by custom and while being broken might be distributed. For this is left from the complete Liturgy."[616]

## 447

**During the koinōnikon, must the priest read the prayers of the Service for Holy Communion and those of the Thanksgiving after Holy Communion, even if it causes delay, or can he omit them?**

The "Service for Holy Communion"[617] and "Thanksgiving after Holy Communion"[618] are private services, which are intended for the individual preparation of every believer, naturally also the priest,

616. PG 155:912a.
617. "Ἀκολουθία τῆς θείας μεταλήψεως."
618. "Εὐχαριστία μετὰ τὴν θείαν μετάληψιν."

who intends to approach for holy communion, to prepare appropriately with prayer, and to give thanks for the great divine gift after his/her participation in it. That they are personal prayers is apparent from the fact that these prayers, the canon, and the other troparia, without any exception, are written in the singular form. This is the same also for the hortatory lines that are addressed again to one person, to an individual: "When about to eat, O human being (Μέλλων φαγεῖν, ἄνθρωπε)... approach (πρόσελθε)... eat (φάγε)... pray (πρόσευξαι)... Behold I approach (Ἰδοὺ βαδίζω)... burn me not (μὴ φλέξῃς με)... When you have obtained (Ἐπὰν δὲ τύχῃς)... offer thanks (εὐχαρίστησον)... say (λέγε)...." Both these services are also unquestionably useful and necessary. However, they do not belong in the Divine Liturgy, but precede and follow during times of individual preparation and thanksgiving. Certainly, this does not preclude their reading by a group that intends to commune or that has communed, as is done in the world, but also on Mount Athos, by priests that will concelebrate or by the entire brotherhood in instances of a communal approach to the undefiled mysteries. However, this never takes place and must not take place at the time of the Divine Liturgy. The Divine Liturgy is something different. I would say the opposite to the "individualistic" spirit that governs these services. In the Divine Liturgy, we exit our own selves and enter hierarchically ordered into the Body of Christ to attain with God's grace and to express this our union in Christ, which is realized, with a common attitude and prayer, and is consummated with our approach to communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. For this reason, also, all of the Liturgy's prayers are composed in a plural number on behalf of the entire mystical body of Christ, of the Church, with the exception only of the prayer, "No one is worthy...,"[619] which concerns the individual preparation of the priest for the performance of the mystery.

619. "Οὐδεὶς ἄξιος..."

Especially for holy communion, the Divine Liturgy has indispensable prayers for all, preparatory before holy communion (the prayer before the "Our Father," the prayer of inclination, and "Hearken, O Lord Jesus Christ..."[620]) and of thanksgiving after holy communion ("We give thanks to you, O Christ our God...").[621] In the ancient manuscripts, there were only these and nothing else. In the late manuscripts, prayers of individual piety and a multitude of troparia invade, which were said opportunely/inopportunely during the koinōnikon, the cheroubikon, and at other points of the Divine Liturgy. The same thing also occurred in modern printed editions, but not also in the Euchologia and in old editions of the Hieratika, which remained faithful to the archaic austerity and solemnity.

The matter is well-explained. When something is eroded from frequent use, we seek its replacement with another newer thing. And again, one understands that the piety of priests sought and seeks an outlet in personal prayer immediately before and immediately after the bold act of holy communion. In any case, no matter how natural and human, this must be kept to a minimum and our individual piety must be subject to the sacred taxis of divine worship. Before the Divine Liturgy, the priest must and can pray individually while reading the service for holy communion and prolong his prayer as much as his soul desires. The same also applies after the Divine Liturgy when one must and can give thanks to God with traditional prayers of thanksgiving and with all his strength. However, at the time of the Divine Liturgy, he does not carry out an individual act, but he serves on behalf of the Church and ought to align himself and submit to the formal simple taxis of the Church.

Besides, the extension of the koinōnikon fatigues the people. And even the most pious priest should think a lot about it and take it into account.

620. "Πρόσχες, Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ..."
621. "Εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι, Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν..."

## 448

**During the Divine Liturgy of the Nativity, when all Christians are attending church, instead of us reading that pericope that narrates the events of the Birth (Luke 2:1–18), we read what took place after this, namely, the adoration of the magi (Matt 2:1–12). Would it not be more preferable for both pericopes to be read in order for the faithful to hear the history of the Birth of Christ?**

The solution to this issue that is posed by the above question obviously cannot be given by the writer or by the priests. It is something that concerns the modification of the readings of the gospel pericopes, which can only take place officially by competent ecclesiastical authority on a Pan-Orthodox basis, after certainly the topic is thoroughly studied in order that correct and responsible solutions are given. Certainly, this does not impede discussion on this point, the attempt for us to understand the reasons for which this takes place as it is done and for us to think about or perhaps even to propose necessary possible solutions. Besides, the issue of the redistribution of the pericopes is considered an "open" topic and under study, given that very correctly it is listed among the topics of the Holy and Great Council, the convening of which is being prepared for a long time.[622] With these presuppositions, we have nothing but praise for this proposal of the questioner that indicates a thinking person and one reflecting on matters not only of a correct celebration of our divine worship, but also of what should be done in it.

And first, let us attempt to understand the reasons that led to the preference of the pericope of Matthew 2:1–12 for the Divine Liturgy for the day of the Nativity feast.

As we said, when we addressed the topic of the Sunday pericopes, the distribution of the readings was done from the perspective that the ecclesiastical community, obviously monastic, attends church daily and consequently hears the whole series of pericopes, namely, not only those of Sundays. Something analogous also happens with the pericopes of the feasts. Indeed, both great feasts of the Nativity and Theophany have liturgical elements organized according to

622. This topic was not included at the 2016 Holy and Great Council.

the pattern of Pascha, with their forefeast "Great Week," the Great Hours of the eve, and the Vespers-vigil with the Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great in imitation of the services of Great Saturday. With the gospel readings that are read during these services, all the pericopes of the evangelists that are related to the event being celebrated are exhausted. Thus, with the Liturgy of the day of the feast, the main celebration is concluded in some manner, and with the transitional gospel pericope, to coin a phrase, an opening is made to the afterfeast elements. For this reason, while during Pascha, with the gospel of the Liturgy, the reading of the Gospel according to John begins with its marvelous introduction; during the Nativity, the pericope of the Gospel of Matthew is read, which narrates no longer the events of the Birth of the Lord, but what happened quite some time after it, namely, the adoration of the magi. Let it be noted that the adoration of the magi constitutes the third theme of the celebration of the Nativity (Birth of Christ, adoration of the shepherds, adoration of the magi). In particular, we should also know that for these three parallel feasts (Pascha—Nativity—Theophany) the weight of the celebration did not fall originally on the Liturgy of the feast day, presently viewed as the primary formal one, but on the vigil, which contained Great Vespers, with the many readings and the baptism of catechumens, and culminated in the Liturgy of Basileios the Great, the great and formal Liturgy of the Church. The Liturgy of the day of the feast, of Saint Iōannēs Chrysostomos, was, as it were, the second Liturgy of the feast, which probably was intended to serve those who were not able to participate in the vigil. Indeed, the gospel pericopes of the Vespers of these three feasts are more exquisite and contain more full and representative narrations of the events being celebrated. After what we have written, it is also understandable why.

Contemporary circumstances are completely different, not certainly in monasteries, but in the temples of cities and villages. The splendid vigils of these great feasts have been transferred to the morning on the eve of the feast and few faithful participate in them. Most come only to Liturgy on the day of the feast and hear what

took place "when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea,"[623] without hearing the gospel of the Birth of the Savior. Based on contemporary circumstances, if the Fathers were to make the choice of the pericope, they would without doubt prefer one more representative. And as such, they chose for the Vespers-vigil the pericope of Luke 2:1–18, as we saw. In order for the present pericope to remain and for great changes not to take place, its reading could begin a few verses further before, from 1:18 ("the birth of Jesus Christ took place in this way"), namely, to also include the gospel of Matins, or, better, for a synthesis of Luke and Matthew to occur (Luke 2:1–18 and Matt 2:1-12), as we have also seen in other instances. But these are matters for the Holy Council to be convened in the future.[624]

## 449

**What relationship exists between the different epistle and gospel pericopes and the saints, during the commemorations of which these pericopes are read? With what criteria, did this choice of pericopes take place? Because sometimes the impression is given that they are completely unrelated.**

In the answer to question 275 that concerned the gospel pericope Luke 8:16–21, which is read in the commemoration of Saint Anna, we wrote generally regarding the difficulties that were experienced by those who selected the pericopes for the feasts of various saints. In the New Testament, there are references only to the honorable Forerunner, the most-holy Theotokos, the apostles, and certain prophets. For the multitude of saints that the Church celebrates, a point of connection had to be found, and this was not always easy. For this reason, indeed sometimes, the relationship of a pericope and a saint being celebrated is extremely superficial. Perhaps this could not be otherwise. Sometimes it appears to us that it does not exist. The truth is that there exist instances where quite a bit of labor and imagination are required for us to discover the correlation. And still, occasionally we find ourselves perplexed and our hypotheses do not

623. Matt 2:1.

624. These matters were not addressed by the 2016 Holy and Great Council.

appear satisfactory to us. In general, however, in these difficult cases, we must realize that we are not the ones who choose the pericopes, but that we must try to explain the reason for the choice, which they made. For all of this, we must address these subjects when placing them within the spiritual framework of persons during that era, while we are attempting to understand their way of thinking and their own criteria. An indispensable presupposition is knowledge of the explanation of the pericopes as made by the Fathers, of the synaxaria and of the lives of the various saints, and of the hymnography that has developed for each sacred person.

Let us note that in the manuscript Evangelistaria and in the Praxapostoloi, agreement is not always observed regarding the saints who have an epistle and gospel reading, nor regarding the readings that are recited for each one. The former depends on local veneration and the latter on the different choices that they made according to time and place. On the basis of tradition that has been crystalized in our printed liturgical books, we will attempt below to see the criteria along general lines for choosing the pericopes, classifying the individual instances into different groups according to them. I trust that this effort will be useful in illuminating certain of the many questions that this general question gives rise to.

The pericopes that are chosen for the feast of saints can be divided into two basic groups: the first into those that are chosen for a specific person, which are also the minority, and the second into those read for many saints that have some common trait, which are also the majority.

1. Falling under the first group are:

A. *Saints that are mentioned by name in the New Testament,* whether because some episode of their life is connected with the sacred events that are recounted there, or because their name alone is mentioned someplace in the Sacred Scriptures. The Theotokos, the Forerunner, the prophets, and a few of the twelve or the seventy apostles belong to this category.

Thus, for the feasts of the Panagia (September 8, November 21, July 2, and August 15), the gospel pericope chosen is that recounting her visit to Elisabeth, obviously for its prophecy, "For behold henceforth all generations will call me blessed" (Luke 1:48). For the Forerunner, the accounts of pertinent episodes from his life that are connected with the feasts (conception, birth, beheading) or wherever his name and his activity as a Forerunner is mentioned: John 1:29–34, Acts 19:1–8 (January 7) — Luke 7:17–30 and Matt 11:2–15 (February 24 and May 25) — Acts 13:25–31 (August 29).

For the commemoration of the prophet Joel (October 19) the pericope of Acts is read where a reference is made to his prophecy regarding the visitation of the Holy Spirit (1:16ff.). For the prophets Elisaios and Elias (June 14, July 20), the pericope from the Catholic Epistle of James (Iakōvos), where mention is made regarding the power of Elias's prayer (5:17) and Luke 4:22–30, where two miracles of Elias and one of Elisaios are mentioned. For the commemoration of Zacharias, the father of the Forerunner (September 5), the pericope of Matt 23:29–39, because ecclesiastical tradition identifies him with Zacharias, the son of Berechiah, who was murdered "between the temple and the altar" (23:35). With the same criterion, the pericopes are also chosen for the Sunday before the Nativity (Heb 11:9–10, 32–40, and Matt 1:1–25) and the First Sunday of the Fast (Heb 11:24–26, 32–40, and John 1:44–52), because while in the former ones the names of the foreparents of Christ are mentioned, the names of the prophets are referenced in the others, according to the original theme of this Sunday. For Anna the grandmother of Christ (September 9, December 9), in the absence of any reading more appropriate, the pericope Luke 8:16–21 was chosen, which mentions names of Christ's relations according to the flesh.

For certain of the twelve apostles, they have chosen gospel pericopes that are referring to important episodes from their lives together with the Lord, for those which exist: John the Theologian (September 26 and May 8) the eleventh eōthinon gospel and the pericope John 19: 25–27, 21:24–25, Thomas (October 6) the ninth eōthinon gospel, Philip (November 14) John 1: 44–52, Matthew (November 16) Matt 9:9–13, Andrew (November 30) John 1:36–52,

Peter and Paul (June 29) the eleventh eōthinon gospel and Matt 16:13–19, and the precious chains of Peter (January 16) the eleventh eōthinon gospel.

For Jude the relative (Brother) of the Lord (June 19), according to the mistaken identity that occurs also in the Synaxaria, the pericope John 14:21–24 is read, where Jude "not Isacariot" submits a question to the Lord. In commemoration of Iakōvos the Brother of God (τοῦ ἀδελφοθέου) (October 23), the pericope Matt 13:54–58, where the brothers of Christ (verse 55) are mentioned by name, which ought to have been also provided for the commemoration of Jude.

As for the epistle readings, for the evangelist John, excerpts from his First Catholic Epistle (4:12–19 and 1:1–7) were preferred and for Jude the Brother of God, his Catholic Epistle. For Philemon and Onesimus (November 22 and February 15), the Epistle to Philemon of the Apostle Paul, where mention is also made of Onesimus. For Timothy (January 22) a pericope from 2 Timothy, where his grandmother and mother are mentioned. For Titus (August 25) a selection of verses from the epistle of the Apostle Paul to him (1:1–5, 2:15, 3:1–2, 12–15). For the other apostles, they have chosen pericopes that make mention regarding their activity (Ananias, October 1: Acts 17:16–34, the deacon Philip, October 11: Acts 8:26–39, Barnabas, June 11: Acts 11:19–30, the protomartyr Stephen, December 27 and August 2: Acts 6:8–15, 7:1–5, 47–60, Matthias, August 9: Acts 1:12–17 and 21–26). For the joint commemoration of the deacons Prochōros and so forth (June 28) the pericope of Acts, which describes the election and also contains their names (6:1–7). It has already been noted that in certain old and modern printed editions of the Apostolos books, on November 14 for the commemoration of the Apostle Philip, the epistle reading was placed of the deacon Philip (Acts 8:26–39), who is celebrated on October 11, from a confusion obviously of the two with the same name (G. Bekatōros, *Taxis* 1952, p. 160,[625] Geōrgios Rēgas, *Questions of the Typikon*, Athens

625. Γεώργιος Μπεκατῶρος, *Τάξις τῶν Ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθιῶν 1983: κατὰ τὸ Τυπικὸν τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Τύποις Φ. Τσιρώνη, 1983), 160.

1954, p. 57[626]). However, this has already been corrected in modern printed editions (just as also in the Venetian edition of 1865).

For other apostles or apostolic figures, they were satisfied in the choice of a pericope where even a mere mention of their name occurs: Dionysios the Areopagite (October 3), Acts 17:16–34 for verse 34; Luke the evangelist (October 18), Col 4:5–11, 14–18 for verse 14; Iakōvos the Brother of God, Galatians 1:11–19, for verse 19; Clement of Rome (November 24), Phil 3:20–21, 4:1–3 for verse 3—the same epistle is also mistakenly provided for his namesake the hieromartyr Clement of Ancyra (January 23), for whom the Typikon of Saint Sophia has the pericope Heb 10:32–7[627] —the evangelist Mark (April 25), 1 Pet 5:6–14 for verse 13; Iakōvos, son of Zebedee (April 30), Acts 12:1–11 for verse 2; and Saint Magdalēnē (July 22), Luke 8:1–3 for verse 2.

B. *Persons that are not mentioned by name in the New Testament, but who the tradition of the Synaxaria associates with an episode that is mentioned in it.* We have three such cases:

1) For the protomartyr Thekla (September 24), the epistle 2 Tim 3:10–15 is provided, because mention is made in verse 11 regarding the persecutions and sufferings of the Apostle Paul in Iconium, from where, according to the apocryphal work[628] and the synaxarion, Thekla came and met the Apostle, and believed in Christ.

2) For the martyr Longinos (October 16), the pericope Matt 27:33–54, because Longinos according to tradition was the centurion who believed during Christ's death (verse 54).

3) For the hieromartyr Ignatios the Godbearer (December 20, January 29), the gospel pericope Mark 9:33–41, because Ignatios was according to tradition the child that Christ embraced.

The case of the Jerusalemite Kanonarion from the seventh century is characteristic, which places the commemoration of Cleopas from

626. Γεώργιος Ρήγας, *Ζητήματα Τυπικοῦ* (Ἀθῆναι: Συνοδινός, 1954), 57.

627. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:208–209.

628. The apocryphal work is *The Acts of Paul and Thekla*. For a discussion and text, see J. K. Elliot, ed., *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian literature in an English Translation based on M. R. James* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 353, 364–374.

the seventy apostles and Luke the evangelist on October 29 and provides the fifth eōthinon gospel (Luke 24:12–35) as a gospel reading. According to tradition, Luke was the one of the two disciples that travelled together with the risen Jesus to Emmaus (see also the fifth eōthinon doxastikon and exaposteilarion: "while travelling with Luke and Cleopas you conversed" and "he travelled together with Luke and Cleopas").[629] However, printed Evangelistaria in use provide another pericope (Luke 10:16–21).

C. *Their name was also a criterion for choosing an epistle or gospel pericope for specific saints.* Nowadays, perhaps this appears a little strange. However, for that period where the choices of the pericopes took place, it was very common, if we judge from the hymography and especially from the couplet lines in verse of the Mēnologion. These mainly, but also many troparia, are dependent on a play on words with the name of the saint being panegyrized, if certainly this name is suitable for such a type of correlation.

Thus, for the saints below, epistle readings are chosen that contain noteworthy words or phrases: For the commemoration of Saint Euphēmia (September 16 and July 11) "διά δυσφημίας καὶ εὐφημίας" (in ill repute and good repute) (2 Cor 6:8).[630] Saint Eustathios (September 20), "ἀντιστῆναι...στῆναι...στῆτε" (to resist...to stand... stand) (Eph 6:13–14). Saint Grēgorios the Illuminator (September 30), "γρηγορεῖτε" (be watchful) (1 Cor 16:13). Blessed Hilarion (October 21) "ἱλαρὸν γὰρ δότην ἀγαπᾷ ὁ Θεός" (for God loves a cheerful giver) (2 Cor 9:7). Saint Theodōros the General (February 8 and June 8), "Θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον" (gift of God) (Eph 2:8). Saint Prokopios (July 8) "ἵνα σου ἡ προκοπὴ φανερὰ ᾖ ἐν πᾶσιν" (so that your progress might be visible to all) (1 Tim 4:15).[631]

629. There are eleven eōthina doxastika and exaposteilaria associated with each of the eleven eōthina gospel readings, respectively.

630. 1 Cor 16:13 is incorrectly cited and has been corrected.

631. In contemporary Modern Greek culture, often an association is made between a person's name and his behavior and personality traits. This can include an association made with a similarly named ancestor in the direct line or a saint.

Similarly, also the gospel pericopes: For the commemoration of Saint Grēgorios the Illuminator, "γρηγορεῖτε οὖν... ἐγρηγόρησεν ἄν" (watch therefore...he would have watched) (Matt 24:42–43). Saint Karpos (October 13), "ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς... καρποὺς καλοὺς ποιεῖ" (from their fruits you will know them...it produces good fruits) (Matt 7:16–20). For Saint Theodōros of Tyre (February 17), "εἶδε τοὺς βάλλοντας τὰ δῶρα αὐτῶν...εἰς τὰ δῶρα τοῦ Θεοῦ" (he saw the one placing their gifts...into the gifts of God) (Luke 21:1, 4). For Saint Polycarp of Smyrna (February 23), "πολὺν καρπὸν φέρει" (it bears much fruit) (John 12:24).

Let us also remember the interesting case of the Typikon of Saint Sophia from the ninth-tenth centuries, which provides for the commemoration of Saint Geōrgios (April 23) apart from the pericope Acts 12:1–11, which was said if the commemoration of the saint fell during the period of the Pentēkostarion, also another, the pericope 1 Cor 3:9–17 for the phrase "Θεοῦ γεώργιον" (a field of God) (verse 9), if the commemoration came "on other days that are not of the Pentēkostarion."[632]

D. *Certain pericopes are chosen for the feast or for commemorations of saints because some phrase or word in them, more rarely their entire content, is connected with the theme of the feast or some characteristic of the person or trait of life of the particular saint himself/herself.* It is obvious that the choice takes place from the preexisting system of sequentially read pericopes. Indeed, the effort is sometimes evident, at least regarding the gospels and the Acts of the Apostles,[633] for a pericope to be taken from the evangelist of the period that is being read at that time. In general, we will follow the order of the Mēnologion.

The Indiction (September 1): 1 Tim 2:1–7, probably for the phrase "testimony at the proper time"[634] and Luke 4:16–22, "to

632. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:270–271.

633. "Πράξεις τῶν Ἀποστόλων." Rather than the Acts of the New Testament, this phrase appears here to be used in a manner similar to the lectionary books known as the Πραξαπόστολοι (Praxapostoloi) as the New Testament readings used at the Divine Liturgy apart from the gospels and the book of Revelation.

634. 1 Tim 2:6.

proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord."[635] The prophet Zacharias (September 5): Hebrews 6:13–20, obviously for the promise of God to Abraham regarding the obtaining of a child, which resembles the case of Zacharias. For a similar reason, for Isaac's birth "through promise,"[636] and "rejoice, O barren one that does not bear,"[637] the pericope Gal 4:22–27 is read at the commemoration of the Ancestors of God (September 9), at the conception and dormition of Saint Anna (December 9 and July 25), and at the birth of the Forerunner (September 23). The dedication of the Church of the Resurrection (September 13): Hebrews 3:1–4, "the house…for every house is built by someone."[638] Saint Cyprian (October 2): 1 Tim 1:12–17, obviously for the phrase, "though I formerly blasphemed and persecuted and insulted him."[639] Saint Dionysios the Areopagite (October 3): Matt 13: 44–54, because perhaps he is compared to the merchant that found the pearl of great price or for the phrase, "every scribe who has been trained for the kingdom of heaven"[640] who "brings out of his treasure what is new and what is old"[641]—the so-called writings of Pseudo-Dionysios were attributed to Saint Dionysios (see, also, "you drew the ineffable from a chosen vessel" of his apolytikion). Blessed Pelagia "the harlot"[642] (October 8): Eph 5:8–19, "for it is a shame even to speak of the things that they do in secret."[643] The earthquake (October 26): Matt 8:23–27, "a great storm arose on the sea."[644]

635. Luke 4:19.
636. Gal 4:28.
637. Gal 4:27.
638. Heb 3:3–4.
639. 1 Tim 1:13.
640. Matt 13:52.
641. Matt 13:52.
642. "τῆς ἀπὸ ἑταιρίδων."
643. Eph 5:12.
644. Matt 8:24. For a discussion of earthquakes and their effects on the Typikon, see Brian Croke, "Two Early Byzantine Earthquakes and their Liturgical Commemoration," *Byzantion* 51 (1981): 122–147; Mark Roosien, "The Liturgical Commemoration of Earthquakes in Late Antique Constantinople: At the Intersection of Ritual, Environment, and Empire" (PhD diss., The University of Notre Dame, 2018); Antti Arjava, "The Mystery Cloud of 536 CE in the Mediterranean Sources," *DOP* 59 (2005): 73–94; Glanville Downey, "Earthquakes at Constantinople and Vicinity, A.D. 342–1454," *Speculum* 30

Saint Iōannēs the Almsgiver (November 12): 2 Cor 9:6–11, "for God loves a cheerful giver…he scattered, he gave to the poor"[645]—the identical epistle for the same reason is said also for Blessed Sampson the Hospitable (June 27)—and Luke 12:32–40, "sell your possessions and give alms."[646]

Saints Paramonos and Philoumenos (November 29): Rom 8:14–22, obviously for the reference to the "the sufferings of this present time"[647]—the same pericope is also provided for Blessed Onouphrios and Petros (June 12) and for the righteous Eudokimos (July 31) perhaps for the first verse of "all who are led by the Spirit of God"[648] or for "we suffer with"[649] and the "suffering of this present time." The prophet Naoum (December 1): 1 Cor 14:20–25 "prophesy…prophesize."[650] The prophet Habbakoum (December 2) "in Elias…they have killed your prophets."[651] The prophet Sophonias[652] (December 3): Rom 10:11–21, refers to the words of the prophets Elias and Moses. Saint Stephen (December 27 and August 2): Matt 21:33–42, the parable of the wicked tenants, probably for the phrase, "another they stoned."[653] The holy 20,000 martyrs in Nicomedia (December 28): Luke 14:25–35, obviously for verse 31, "to meet him who comes against him with twenty thousand," no matter how much it appears unlikely. The Holy Infants of Bethlehem (December 29): Heb 2:11–18 for "here I am, and the children which God has given me. Since therefore the children share in flesh and blood…."[654] The holy seventy apostles (January 4): Luke 10:1–15, where the commission of

---

(1955): 596–600; and Emanuela Guidoboni, *Catalogue of ancient earthquakes in the Mediterranean area up to the 10th century* (Bologna: Istituto Nationale di Geofisica, 1994).

645. 2 Cor 9:7, 9.

646. Luke 12:33.

647. Rom 8:18.

648. Rom 8:14.

649. Rom 8:17.

650. 1 Cor: 14:22, 24.

651. Rom 11:2, 3. Phountoulēs does not mention the assigned epistle reading for the Saint.

652. Zephaniah (Hebrew).

653. Matt 21:35.

654. Heb 2:13–14.

the seventy disciples is described. Saint Grēgorios of Nyssa (January 10): Matt 4:25, 5:1–12, the Beatitudes, obviously for the sermons on the Beatitudes by Grēgorios—the Typikon of Saint Sophia provides the common pericope for hierarchs, Matt 5:14–17.[655] Blessed Maximos the Confessor (January 21): Phil 1:12–20, where Paul speaks regarding his imprisonment for Christ. Symeōn the God-Receiver (February 3): Heb 9:11–14, which refers to the tent, the temple, and the worship of the Jewish temple. The martyr Nikēphoros (February 9): Eph 5:8–19, perhaps for the phrase, "the fruit of the Spirit is found in all that is good,"[656] in reference to the episode with the presbyter Saprikios, which the synaxarion chronicles. For the commemorations of the discoveries of the Forerunner's head (February 24 and May 25), the epistle pericope 2 Cor 4:6–15 was chosen, probably for the phrase, "but we have this treasure in earthen vessels,"[657] because in the narrative of the synaxarion, the head of the Forerunner was found during its first discovery "in an earthenware vessel" and during its second, "in a water-pot." The Holy Forty Martyrs (March 9): the parable of the vinedressers, Luke 20:1–16, perhaps for the incident of the "cowardice" of one of them, who Aglaios (Ἀγλάϊος) the "prison warder"[658] replaced, the "last one" (ἔσχατος) who received the same crown as the "first ones." The Annunciation (March 25): Heb 2:11–18, "therefore he had to be made like his brethren in every respect"[659]—the incarnation of the Son of God. Blessed Maria of Egypt (April 1), the pericope of questionable authenticity of the adulterous woman (John 8:3–11), in reference to the sinful life of the Blessed one before repentance. Saint Geōrgios (April 23): Acts 12:1–11, which narrates the release of Peter from prison, which obviously is parallel to similar marvelous episodes that the Martyrology chronicles. The prophets Jeremiah and Isaiah (May 1 and 9): 1 Thess 2:14–20, where mention is made regarding the Jews who murdered "their own prophets."[660] In remembrance of the cross that appeared

655. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église,* 1:192–195.
656. Eph 5:9.
657. 2 Cor 4:7.
658. "καπικλάριος."
659. Heb 2:17.
660. 1 Thess 14:15 (not an exact quote).

in the heavens (May 7): Acts 26:1, 12–20. The "heavenly vision"[661] ("above the brightness of the sun…a light")[662] of the Apostle Paul is compared with the appearance of the Cross ("formed of light… it outshone the rays of the sun by its brilliance").[663] Saint Kōnstantinos (May 21): Acts 26:1, 12–20, the vision and the calling from heaven of the Apostle Paul, with which the vision and calling of Kōnstantinos the Great is compared (see the apolytikion: "and as Paul receiving the calling not from human beings"). The Typikon of Saint Sophia varies again also the epistle reading; the above is provided "if these are the days of Pentecost." Outside of the period of Pascha, the pericope Gal 1:11–19, "I make known to you the gospel…," is appointed, which also again refers to Paul's calling from God.[664] For the same saint, two gospel readings "for hierarchs" are provided for by our present-day liturgical books, John 10:9–16 ("I am the door…") for Matins and John 10:1–9 ("Amen…he who does not enter by the door") for the Divine Liturgy. The historian Eusebios writes regarding Kōnstantinos the Great that he was "just as a general bishop established by God" and the same one said regarding himself, "but I might be a bishop established by God over the outside" (Eusebios, *Life of Kōnstantinos the Great* 1.44, 4.24).[665] In the councils, the emperor is acclaimed; "Many years to the high-priest (or to the sacred) emperor" (Mansi, 6:733, 734; 7:177).[666] Thus, the choice of readings for hierarchs can also be justified for Kōnstantinos the Great (cf. also the doxastikon of the aposticha of Vespers: "being anointed with oil both priest and emperor"). However, the Typikon of Saint Sophia has only the reading for the Divine Liturgy, not precisely John 10:1–9, but one similar: John 10:2–5 and 27–30.[667] The

661. Acts 26:19.

662. Acts 26:13.

663. This is a quotation from the synaxarion's adaptation of a letter attributed to Saint Cyril of Jerusalem (ca. 348/50–386/7) addressed to Constantius II, emperor (r. 337–361); cf. the text contained in PG 33:1169.

664. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:296–297.

665. Compare the translation and analysis in Averil Cameron and Stuart G. Hall, trans., *Eusebius, Life of Constantine*, Clarendon Ancient Christian Writers Series (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 8, 44, 87, 161.

666. Mansi 6:733, 734; 7:177, 178.

667. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:296–297.

center of gravity is shifted, as well as in the Old Testament readings of Vespers, to the God-protected city and to the Christian ecumene, whose founder and first faithful emperor was Kōnstantinos the Great. The slipping to the pericope for hierarchs may have occurred later because of the similarity of the two pericopes.

The birth of the Forerunner (June 24): Rom 13:11–14, 14:1–4, probably because the birth of the Forerunner is a harbinger of the imminent day of the Lord or for fasting, regarding which mention is made in the second part of the pericope. John is the preeminent faster. Saints Kērykos and Ioulitta (July 15): 1 Cor 13:11–13, 14:1–5 for the word "infant," found five times at the beginning of the pericope, and Matt 17: 24–27, 18:1–4 again for the word "child," which is found three times at the end of the reading. Saint Kērykos was a three-year old infant. Blessed Symeōn the Fool for Christ (July 21): 1 Cor 3:18–23, "if any one among you thinks that he is wise in this age, let him become a fool that he may become wise."[668] Mary Magdalēnē equal to the apostles (July 22): 1 Cor 9:2–12, for "to take along a woman, a sister."[669] The holy hieromartyr Hermolaos (July 26): 1 Tim 3:13–16, 4:1–5 obviously for "how one ought to behave in the house of God...those serving well as deacons gain a good position for themselves."[670] Saint Eusignios (August 5): 1 Pet 1:1–25, 2:1–10, a lengthy pericope, which does not have any relation to the saint, but is without question for a forefeast of the Transfiguration. The apostle Peter was one of its three witnesses and, in his epistle, speaks regarding the "marvelous light"[671] and the "glory"[672] of Christ. The holy Mandēlion (August 16): 1 Tim 3:13–16, 4:1–5 perhaps for "God was manifested in the flesh...was seen...,"[673] Luke 9:51–57,

668. 1 Cor 3:18.

669. 1 Cor 9:5 (ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα περιάγειν). In other words, this can be understood as, "to take along a believing woman." If translated as "to take along a woman as a wife," the Scriptural quotation would make no sense with regard to Mary Magdalēnē, who was not a wife to an apostle.

670. 1 Tim 3:15, 13.

671. 1 Pet 2:9.

672. 1 Pet 1:11.

673. 1 Tim 3:16, see the Patriarchal text, *Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη ἐγκρίσει τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1912), 493.

10:22–24, "his face…blessed are the eyes which see what you see… many prophets and kings desired to see what you see, and did not see it."[674] The synaxarion, drawing from the pertinent apocryphal work, relates that "Abgar…was desiring to see our Lord Jesus Christ with his own eyes and was unable" and that he obtained what he desired through the holy Mandēlion.[675] The martyrs Flōros and Lauros (August 18): Col 1:24–29, 2:1, for "I rejoice in my sufferings."[676] And finally, the prophet Samuel (August 20): 1 Cor 14:20–26, because mention is made regarding prophecy in this pericope.

There are some, fortunately relatively few, cases of pericopes that are provided for certain saints, which do not easily yield the solution to the mystery of their selection. All possible combinations and hypotheses have been fruitless. These cases are the following:

- John 10:1–11 for Saint Mamas (September 2). The Typikon of Saint Sophia also provides for the same pericope.[677]
- Rom 6:18–23 for Saint Sōzon (September 7). Perhaps the related concepts of σώζω (I save)—ἐλευθερώνω (I set free)? The *Codex Paris 1590* from the year 1063 has the common pericope for martyrs, 2 Tim 2:1–10.
- Col. 3:4–11 for the martyrs Markianos and Martyrios (October 25). The same pericope is read also on the Sunday of the Forefathers perhaps because it speaks concerning the future manifestation of Christ or for "there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised."[678]
- Eph 2:4–10 for the martyrs Akepsimas and so forth, or for the translation of the relics of Saint Geōrgios (November 3). The same pericope, however, for another reason as we saw, is read

674. Luke 9:53, 10:23–24.

675. For a discussion of the apocryphal works, see H.J.W. Drijvers, "The Abgar Legend" in *New Testament Apocrypha, Volume One: Gospels and Related Writings*, ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher and trans. R. McL. Wilson, revised edition (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991), 492–500.

676. Col 1:24.

677. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:10–13. The Typikon as edited here contains John 15:1–11 for the gospel reading.

678. Col 3:11.

also for Saint Theodōros. From perhaps this martyr, reading was extended also to other martyrs.

- 2 Cor 9:6–11 for Saint Iōannikios (November 4). Perhaps also here something occurs analogous to the preceding instance. From Saint Iōannēs the Almsgiver and Blessed Sampson the Hospitable, where it is provided for another reason, it was also extended to another blessed one.
- Luke 20:46–47, 21:1–4 for the martyrs Gourias, Samōnas, and Abibos[679] (November 15). The Typikon of Saint Sophia has the common pericope for martyrs, John 15:17–27, 16:1–2.[680]
- Eph 5:8–19 for Saint Spyridōn (December 12). Perhaps, "awake, O sleeper, and arise from the dead,"[681] can be considered as an allusion to the resurrection of his daughter?
- Mark 2:23–38, 3:1–2 for Saint Eleutherios (December 15). Perhaps the freedom[682] from the works of the law and the Sabbath?
- Luke 9:12–18, the multiplication of the loaves, for Saint Alexios the Man of God (March 17). Perhaps trust in the marvelous providence of God?
- And finally, Luke 6:17–19, 9:1, 10:16–22 for Saint Prokopios (July 8). Perhaps the miracles, the healings, and the expulsion of demons? The Typikon of Saint Sophia provides the common gospel pericope for martyrs, Luke 21:12-19.[683]

2. Falling under the second group are pericopes that are used for many saints that have some common characteristic.

We must imagine that the development of this system starts much the same as the selections of psalms that are chanted with the

679. When transliterated from the Syriac, these Edessan martyrs commonly appear as "Guria," "Shmona," and "Habib." For a discussion of these martyrs, see Susan Ashbrook Harvey, "The Edessan Martyrs and Ascetic Tradition," OCA 236 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990), 195–206.

680. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:104–105. See also question 566.

681. Eph 5:14.

682. "ἡ ἐλευθερία."

683. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:332–335.

polyeleos in vigils. Namely, just as there, the compilation of psalmic verses occurs for a certain saint and is extended afterwards to saints of the same category (Saint Iōannēs Chrysostomos to hierarchs, Saint Sabas to the blessed, Saint Dēmētrios to martyrs), in a similar way a pericope chosen for one particular saint is generalized also to others that have common characteristics with him/her. In our printed liturgical books of the Gospel, Apostolos, Euchologion, and Anthologion, as well as in the corresponding manuscripts, there are collections of such pericopes at the end, which usually are entitled, "For the Unnamed."[684] They are separated into pericopes "for the bodiless," "for an apostle," "for apostles," "for a martyr," "for martyrs," and so forth. These pericopes are sometimes the same as those that exist for great saints of the Mēnologion, to which they also refer, or are different. Sometimes there is one for each group of saints, at other times more, perhaps in order that a choice takes place of the one most appropriate, or that the same ones are not always read. For example, in the Typikon of Saint Sophia from the tenth century, at the end, there are four pairs of pericopes "for the blessed": Acts 12:1–11—Matt 10:37–42; Eph 6:10–17—Matt 11:27–30; 2 Pet 1:2–10—Mark 8:34–9:1; and Heb 13:7–16—John 12:25–26, 31-36a.[685] In other manuscript Evangelistaria, five gospel pericopes "for martyrs or hieromartyrs" are provided: John 15:17–16:3, Luke 11:29–33, Luke 20:46–21:19, John 15:1–7, and Matt 10:16–22.

Thus, gradually, the "Mēnologion" of the Gospel book and of the Apostolos is formed, which aims, especially for the Apostolos, to have readings for each feast and saint, significant or not. Namely, the editors of the printed editions endeavor to facilitate the celebration of the services when noting, almost for every day, the epistle and gospel readings, using the common readings of the unnamed ones or even other ones in order that the sequence be completed. In other respects, this praiseworthy effort (after the prevalence of reciting one pair of readings from a misunderstanding of pertinent rubrics as we saw in preceding answers) lead to the absurdity of supplanting the continuous reading of the entire New Testament, which is found in

684. "Τῶν ἀνωνύμων."
685. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:193.

the first part of the pertinent books, and to the unacceptable and antitraditional repetition ad nauseam of the same pericopes, namely, of the "unnamed" pericopes. Thus, without the saint being celebrated, having a full service, the temple having its feast day in his/her name, or even, also, some icon of his/her existing, his/her pericopes are preferred to the sequential pericopes. In the answer to question 421, we undertook rough statistics and saw that in one hundred days of the year 1983, of which eighty-five were weekdays, the *Calendar-Typikon* prescribed only ten epistle readings to be read from the sequential pericopes and seventy-five from the Mēnologion, with a frequency of repetition for the same pericope up until even nine times. Certainly, for this reason, the system—which is good—is not to blame, but rather its improper application, which we hope someday is given the required attention.

And, in order for us to return to our topic. The choice of pericopes for different categories of saints takes place with the same method and roughly the same criteria that we saw previously. Namely, in principle, a pericope is sought that has complete relevance to the attribute of the saint. If this is not possible—and usually it is not—pericopes are chosen where their one part or even their few phrases correspond to the theme. Again, the choice is done on the basis of the preexisting system of pericopes of the continuous reading of the New Testament. In many pericopes, this is particularly obvious.

Below we shall deal with these pericopes as briefly as possible, while highlighting within parentheses the reason for their choice.

A. *For the most-holy Theotokos.* Phil 2:5–11. "Having this in mind among yourselves..."[686] ("taking the form of a servant being born in the likeness of humanity"[687]—the incarnation). Heb 9:1–7, "The first covenant had..."[688] (the Theotokos is the dwelling—the temple of God).

686. Phil 2:5.
687. Phil 2:7.
688. Heb 9:1.

B. *For the Prophets:* Jas 3:10–20, "Take for example..."[689] ("prophets[690]...Job[691]...Elias"[692]). Heb 11:33–40, 12:1–2, "All the saints..."[693] (the entire text). Luke 11:47–54, 12:1, "Woe unto you scribes..."[694] ("the tombs of the prophets[695]...in the blood of the prophets[696]...murdering the prophets[697]...I send to you prophets..."[698]).

C. *For the Bodiless:* Heb 2:2–10, "If the word spoken by angels..."[699] (the entire pericope). Matt 18:10–20, "Take heed that you despise..."[700] (the guardian angel—the one hundred sheep).[701] Luke 10:16–21, "He that hears you..."[702] ("the demons are subject[703]...I beheld Satan"[704]).

D. *For the Apostles:* 1 Cor 4:9–16, "God has set forth for us the apostles..."[705] (the entire pericope). Matt 9:36–38, 10:1–8, "Jesus seeing the crowds...," Mark 3:13–21, "He goes up to the mountain and calls..."[706] (both pericopes contain the list of the twelve apostles' names). Luke 9:1–6, "Jesus called his twelve disciples together..."[707] (the entire pericope). Matt 10:32–33, 37–38, 19:27–30, "Whoever

689. Jas 3:10.
690. Jas 3:10.
691. Jas 3:11.
692. Jas 3:17.
693. Heb 11:33.
694. Luke 11:47.
695. Luke 11:47.
696. Luke 11:50.
697. Matt 23:31. "φονευσάντων τοὺς προφήτας." This phrase does not appear in Luke 11:47–54, 12:1.
698. Matt 23:34. "ἀποστέλλω πρὸς ἡμᾶς προφήτας." Similar to Luke 11:49, this phrase does not appear in Luke 11:47–54, 12:1.
699. Heb 2:10.
700. Matt 18:10.
701. Matt 18:12.
702. Luke 10:16.
703. Luke 10:17.
704. Luke 10:18.
705. 1 Cor 4:9.
706. Mark 3:13.
707. Luke 9:1.

shall confess me..."[708] (the taking up of the cross). Luke 10:16–21, "He that hears you..."[709] (the entire pericope).

E. *For the Martyrs:* Rom 8:28–39, "We know that for those who love God..."[710] ("Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Tribulation...sword[711] ...we were reckoned as sheep for slaughter[712]... neither death"[713]). Eph 6:10–17, "Be strong in the Lord..."[714] (the soldiers of Christ). Col 1: 24–29, 2:1, "Now I rejoice in my sufferings..."[715] ("I complete in my flesh what is lacking in Christ's afflictions...").[716] 2 Tim 2:1–10, "Be strong in the grace..."[717] ("take your share of suffering as a good soldier of Jesus Christ[718]...an athlete is not crowned unless he competes according to the rules[719] ...I am suffering and wearing fetters as a criminal"[720]). Heb 10:32–38, "Recall the former days..."[721] ("a hard struggle with sufferings"[722] and so forth). Heb 11: 33–40, 12:1–2 (the sufferings of all the saints—"a cloud of witnesses (μαρτύρων)"[723]). Heb 12:1–10, "Surrounded by so great a cloud of witnesses (μαρτύρων)..."[724] ("let us run the race set before us, looking to[725]...he endured the Cross[726]...you have not yet resisted to the point of shedding blood"[727]). Matt 10:16–22, "Be-

708. Matt 10:32.
709. Luke 10:16.
710. Rom 8:28.
711. Rom 8:35.
712. Rom 8:36.
713. Rom 8:38.
714. Eph 6:10.
715. Col 1:24.
716. Col 1:24.
717. 2 Tim 2:1.
718. 2 Tim 2:3.
719. 2 Tim 2:5.
720. 2 Tim 2:9.
721. Heb 10:32.
722. Heb 10:32.
723. Heb 12:1.
724. Heb 12:1.
725. Heb 12:1–2.
726. Heb 12:2.
727. Heb 12:4.

hold I send you forth…"[728] Luke 21:12–19, "Beware of men…."[729] John 15:17–27, 16:1–2, "These things I command you…"[730] (also the three entire pericopes).

F. *For Hieromartyrs:* 2 Tim 1:8–18, "Be not ashamed of the testimony (μαρτύριον)…"[731] ("prisoner…partake of the sufferings"[732]). Matt 10:32–36, 11:1, "Whoever shall confess me…"[733] (confession). Matt 11:27–30, "All things have been given unto me…"[734] ("Come unto me all who labor…").[735]

G. *For Hierarchs–Fathers:* Titus 3:8–15, "This is a faithful saying…"[736] ("foolish controversies[737]…heretical man"[738]). Heb 5:4–10, "No one takes this honor for himself…"[739] and Heb 7:26–28, 8:1–2, "For it was fitting such a high priest for us…"[740] and Heb 8:1–6, "We have such a high priest…"[741] (Christ the high priest). Heb 13:7–16, "Remember you leaders…"[742] ("they spoke to you the word of God; consider the outcome of their life and imitate their faith").[743] Matt 5:14–17, "You are the light of the world…"[744] (the light, the city, the light "on the lampstand,"[745] "let your light so shine[746]… does and teaches"[747]). John 10:1–9, "Amen…he who does not enter

728. Matt 10:16.
729. Luke 21:12.
730. John 15:17.
731. 2 Tim 1:8.
732. 2 Tim 1:8.
733. Matt 10:32.
734. Matt 11:27.
735. Matt 11:28.
736. Titus 3:8.
737. Titus 3:9.
738. Titus 3:10.
739. Heb 5:4.
740. Heb 7:26.
741. Heb 8:1.
742. Heb 13:7.
743. Heb 13:7.
744. Matt 5:14.
745. Matt 5:15.
746. Matt 5:16.
747. Matt 5:19.

through the door,"[748] and John 10:9–16 "I am the door…"[749] ("the good shepherd").[750]

H. *For Confessors:* Luke 12:8–12, "Whoever shall confess…"[751] (confession).

I. *For the Blessed:* 2 Cor 4:6–15, "who said light to shine from darkness…"[752] ("carrying in the body the death of the Lord Jesus").[753] Gal 5:22–26, 6:1-2, "The fruit of the Spirit…"[754] ("and those who belong to Christ have crucified the flesh with it passions and desires").[755] Eph 6:10–17, "Be strong in the Lord…"[756] (the struggle against the devil). Col 3:12–16, "Put on then as God's chosen ones…"[757] (the virtues). Heb 13:7–16, "Remember you leaders…,"[758] and Heb 13:17–21, "Obey you leaders…"[759] (our leaders, obedience, "the shepherd of the sheep…").[760] Matt 4:23–25, 5:1–13, "He went about all Galilee…,"[761] and Luke 6:17–23 "he stood on a level place…"[762] (the Beatitudes). Matt 11:27–30, "All things are delivered unto me…"[763] (the "ones who labor and heavy-laden,"[764] the taking up of the yoke of Christ). Luke 12:32–40, "Fear not, little flock…"[765] ("the little flock," the wakefulness).

748. John 10:1.
749. John 10:9.
750. John 10:11.
751. Luke 12:8.
752. 2 Cor 4:6.
753. 2 Cor 4:10.
754. Gal 5:22.
755. 2 Cor 4:24.
756. Eph 6:10.
757. Col 3:12.
758. Heb 13:7.
759. Heb 13:17.
760. Heb 13:20.
761. Matt 4:23.
762. Luke 6:17–23.
763. Matt 11:27.
764. Matt 11:28.
765. Luke 12:32.

J. *For the Blessed Martyrs:* Matt 7:12–21, "So whatever you wish that men…"[766] ("the gate is narrow, and the way is hard").[767]

L. *For Women Generally:* Gal 3:23–29, 4:1–15, "Before faith came…"[768] ("neither male nor female[769]…came from a woman"[770]). *Women martyrs:* Mark 5:24–34, "A great multitude followed Jesus…"[771] (the woman with an issue of blood). Luke 7:36–50 "One of the Pharisees asked him…"[772] (the sinner). *Blessed women:* the parable of the ten virgins, Matt 25:1–13.

M. *For Healers—Wonderworking Saints:* 1 Cor 12:7–11, "To each one is given…,"[773] 1 Cor 12:27–31, 13:1–8, "You are the body of Christ…" (the gifts of healings). Matt 10:1, 5–8, "Calling the twelve…"[774] ("heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out demons; freely you have received, freely give").[775] Luke 10:19–21, "Behold, I give to you…"[776] (the authority "to tread upon serpents and scorpions,"[777] "the spirits are subject to you"[778]).

Finally, a pericope of general content (2 Thess 2:13–17, 3:1–5, "We are bound to give thanks to God…")[779] is provided for three saints that do not appear to have anything in common, Saint Ambrose (December 7), Blessed Patapios (December 8), and the martyr Christina (July 24).

---

766. Matt 7:12. In the translation, the mistaken quotation of Matt 11:27 is corrected.
767. Matt 7:14.
768. Gal 3:23.
769. Gal 3:28.
770. Gal 4:4.
771. Mark 5:24.
772. Luke 7:36.
773. 2 Cor 12:27.
774. Matt 10:1.
775. Matt 10:8.
776. Luke 10:19.
777. Luke 10:19.
778. Luke 10:20.
779. 2 Thess 2:13.

## 450

**The second stichēron of lauds for Saint Dēmētrios, "Τεῖχος ὠχυρωμένον ἡμῖν..." (A fortified wall for us...), was published in the edition of the Apostolikē Diakonia (1960) with a significant correction. Is it permitted for such intrusions of this type to occur in our liturgical texts?**

In order that we not repeat what we wrote earlier regarding similar topics, let the answers to questions 225, 256, and, indeed, 417 be read, which refer respectively to "O Lord, save the pious,"[780] "For pious and orthodox Christians,"[781] and "O Lord save your people... grant victory to the kings over the barbarians."[782] There, we saw how the matter stands historically and deontologically of adapting certain entreaties or phrases of our church hymns. The case of the troparion of Saint Dēmētrios confirms what we wrote in the answer to 417, a precisely parallel question.[783]

The contested phrase of the troparion, "Τεῖχος ὠχυρωμένον ἡμῖν..." (A fortified wall for us...), is: "ἥν καὶ νῦν, παμμακάριστε, δεινῶς κινδυνεύουσαν καὶ τρυχομένην ἀθλίως" (which even now, O all-blessed one, is terribly endangered and wretchedly distressed) in the manuscripts and in all the printed editions of the Mēnaia. In the recent edition of the Apostolikē Diakonia, this phrase becomes, "ἥν λυτρωθεῖσαν, ἔνδοξε, Θεοῦ εὐδοκήσαντος, διὰ παντὸς ἐλευθέραν" (which, is delivered, O glorious one, God being well-pleased, free forever).[784] The original text refers to the dangers and difficult circumstances that Thessaloniki continually passed through during its centuries-old history, without specifying which ones specifically it means. I do not know from where was derived the information, which the elder Gabriēl Dionysiatēs of blessed memory delivered in a lecture of his, that the three stichēra of the lauds for Saint Dēmētrios ("Δεῦρο, μάρτυς Χριστοῦ, πρὸς ἡμᾶς...," Come, O

780. "Κύριε, σῶσον τοὺς εὐσεβεῖς."
781. "Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν."
782. "Σῶσον Κύριε τὸν λαόν σου...νίκας τοῖς βασιλεῦσι κατὰ βαρβάρων..."
783. The text most likely was mistaken in referencing 419.
784. A less literal translation could be, "which O glorious one is delivered free forever, God being well-pleased."

martyr of Christ, to us...; "Τεῖχος ὠχυρωμένον ἡμῖν...," A fortified wall for us...;"and "Πᾶσαν τὴν ἀρετὴν συλλαβών...," Attaining every virtue...) were written by Saint Theodōros the Stoudite during his exile from Thessaloniki and are referring to the persecutions of the Orthodox by the iconoclasts.[785] It is rather more likely that the above phrase at least suggests barbarian invasions or conquests. The archbishop of Athens Chrysostomos of blessed memory made its correction after the liberation of Thessaloniki (1912), and it was published with this explanation[786] in the *Calendars* of the Church of Greece at that time. In the new edition of the Mēnaia by the Apostolikē Diakonia, the troparion was published "according to the correction... officially introduced and accepted," as recorded in the footnote (p. 154a).[787] The correction is metrically correct and certainly apt, and I think, moreover in keeping with we wrote previously, the new edition rightly adopted it.

Particularly, the service of Saint Dēmētrios also knew in the past other similar adjustments, either in order that the hymns reflect new historical circumstances or for some troparia to be adapted for the universal honoring of the great martyr, whereas originally, they pertained only to the city of Thessaloniki, where the tomb and great temple-martyrium of the saint are located. In the first case, the revision of the first two troparia from the ninth ode of the forefeast's canon— "Μὴ δειλιᾷς, ὦ πατρίς μου..." (Do not fear, O my fatherland...) and "Ἐπὶ ταῖς σαῖς μεσιτείαις..." (Upon your intercessions...), by Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, chanted according to "Κύματι θαλάσσης" (In the waves of the sea) —occurred during the time of the Tourkokratia. The phrases: "Θεσσαλονίκη πόλις, ἣν ἐκ δεινῶν ἐλευθερῶ ἀεὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς" (City of Thessaloniki, which I always free from dangers by prayers) of the first troparion, and "ἡ πατρίς σου τοῦ κινδυνεῦσαι δεινῶς κλονουμένη ἀθλίως" (your fatherland distressingly battered to be terribly endangered) of the second

785. Gabriēl of Dionysiou (1886–1983), abbot of the monastery of Dionysiou on Mount Athos (1934–1975), was the author of a large number of spiritual and pastoral works.

786. Namely, that Thessaloniki had been liberated.

787. *Μηναῖον τοῦ Ὀκτωβρίου* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 1973), 154a.

troparion, became respectively, "ὑπάχθεῖσα τυράννοις, ὧν δι' ἐμοῦ ἀπαλλαγὴν εὑρεῖν ἐπιζητεῖς" (which is brought under tyrants, which you seek to find a release through me) and "παρὰ δόξαν ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν δεινῶν στροβουμένη" (because of glory in the midst of dangers becoming faint). In the second case, there is the attempt to correct the doxastikon of the lauds, "Τὸν λόγχαις κληρωσάμενον..." (Who inherited by spears...), of Saint Andreas of Crete, where the phrase towards the end, "τῶν Θεσσαλονικέων προϊστάμενον" (guardian of Thessaloniki) became "πᾶσι τοῖς εὐσεβέσι προϊστάμενον" (guardian for all the pious), see Church Typikon of Kōnstantinos, Prōtopsaltēs, in Constantinople 1874, p. 32.[788] This correction is disapproved of by the Typikon of Geōrgios Violakēs, *Typikon of the Great Church of Christ*, in Athens 1921, p. 91, footnote 1, "since neither does it succeed grammatically...nor is it approved for troparia to be modified according to whim, in which mention is certainly made of events having historical significance [?], on this account it is recommended that the chanter strictly observe the text as found."[789] Conversely, it appears that the correction of the saint's apolytikion, and its adjustment to the universal honoring of the myrrhgusher, did not find any opposition and even became also prevalent in Thessaloniki, so much so that the original text was forgotten. In this manner, "σὲ ὑπέρμαχον Θεσσαλονίκη" (to defender of Thessaloniki) became "σὲ ὑπέρμαχον ἡ οἰκουμένη" (to defender of the ecumene). For the same reason, the declaration of the saint's name, "μεγαλομάρτης Δημήτριε." (O great martyr Dēmētrios) was added to the original text and remained, which metrically increases and was unnecessary for Thessaloniki where its "saint" was preeminent, but was deemed necessary for its use outside of Thessaloniki.

788. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 32. Saint Andreas of Crete (ca. 660–ca. 740).

789. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 91, footnote 1.

## 451

**If during the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, no one approaches for communion, is then the Divine Liturgy complete?**

As the question is formulated, the answer cannot be other than negative. The Divine Liturgy in itself, namely a celebration of the mystery of the Eucharist, is not conceivable as anything but complete and perfect, even if no Christian communes. It is not possible for its validity or fullness to depend on the percentage of the people's participation in the mysteries. Moreover, undoubtedly there existed cases in the past, and it is not rare also nowadays, of its celebration without even one believer also communing. Certainly, the obligation exists regarding the presence of even a small representative community, even of one person, irrespective of clerical or lay, apart from the celebrating priest. It is assumed that someone will commune. But if perchance no one communes, the Liturgy, in any case, remains full and complete. This is the one element we can also be categorical about.

As regards to the other element, the believer or faithful attending the service who are not approaching holy communion, the Divine Liturgy is not perfect in their regard, given that their participation is incomplete and deontologically improper. Certainly, the believer who attends church is partially sanctified with entering and remaining in the temple of God, by his/her participation in the sacred synaxis, chanting, and attentiveness; by the hearing of the sacred readings and preaching; by veneration of icons and attendance of the sacred services; by the incense, the commemoration in the diptychs; and, especially, by the presence of the Holy Spirit, the commemoration of the Lord and the sight and veneration of the sacred mysteries, of the Body and Blood of the Lord. However, complete and perfect participation is not understood except with the communion of the Mysteries. Moreover, the Divine Liturgy also takes place for this reason, and this is its aim, essential content, and outcome, namely the celebration of the mystery of the mystical supper, in order for the faithful to sup[790] and to partake of the Lord's life-sustaining table

790. "δειπνήσουν."

and to be sanctified and united in one flesh and one spirit with Christ. The synaxis, teaching, and prayer are important elements, but not the main elements of the liturgical synaxis of the Church.

Certainly, the increase of Christians in name only and the decrease of intensity, as well as apathy and poor practice, habituated us with the phenomenon for even those who did not have impediments and a spiritual father's spiritual prohibition not to approach holy communion and for anyone attending church and not communing to be consider a norm and for approaching holy communion to be considered an exception. Namely, the celebration of the mystery of the Holy Eucharist and our participation in it being changed into a "church attendance"[791] that is painless and with very little benefit. Despite these things, the Church never ceased regularly—on a daily basis—to celebrate the Divine Liturgy as an invitation, encouragement, and reminder of the need for our participation in the mystery of life and to urge by word and action our return to what is right. And its most characteristic activity is that, despite the change of ancient good habits in the meantime, it continued to celebrate the Presanctified during Great Lent on days that the celebration of the Divine Liturgy is not permitted and to remind in this way that communion stands as an ideal, to which we must be directed, not only on Saturdays and Sundays, but also on the intermediate days of the week, on Wednesdays and Fridays, as in the period of the Great Fathers (Basileios the Great, *Letter 93, To the Patrician Kaisaria*).[792]

---

791. "ἐκκλησιασμό." This word appears related to the phrase "I will attend church" (θὰ ἐκκλησιαστώ), which can be used in Modern Greece to mean that one will receive a blessing by merely attending a service, without the necessity of receiving communion. Often the fact one is receiving communion is distinguished from mentioning church attendance in general (θὰ κοινωνήσω, θὰ μεταλάβω).

792. "Ἡμεῖς μέντοιγε τέταρτον καθ' ἑκάστην ἑβδομάδα κοινωνοῦμεν, ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ, ἐν τῇ Τετράδι καὶ ἐν τῇ Παρασκευῇ καὶ τῷ Σαββάτῳ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἡμέραις, ἐὰν ᾖ μνήμη Ἁγίου τινός" (We indeed commune four times each week, on Sunday, on Wednesday, and on Friday, and on Saturday, and on other days, if there might be a commemoration of a saint), Basileios the Great, *Letter* 93, in *Saint Basile Lettres*, ed. and trans. Yves Courtonne, 3 vols. (Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1957–1966), 1:203–204.

In this sense, subjectively as regards the believer not participating in communion, the Divine Liturgy, or rather his/her participation in the Divine Liturgy, is not complete.

## 452

**In the funeral of priests, why is "Alleluia" often said two times and not three, as usual?**

In the first part of the funeral service "for a priest who died,"[793] the chanting of three psalms is provided for (Psalm 22, "The Lord is my shepherd...,"[794] Psalm 23, "The earth is the Lord's...,"[795] and Psalm 83, "How beloved are your dwellings...[796]), at each verse of which the ephymnion "Alleluia twice"[797] is repeated. This is the only case in present-day liturgical practice that the "Alleluia" is chanted twice, while it is very customary for it to be chanted three times or only once.

However, in the old practice, there were three ways of chanting the "Alleluia," which were characteristically named "single,"[798] "double,"[799] or "triple Alleluia."[800] The "double Alleluia" is especially encountered quite often in the ancient "asmatic," secular or parish services. In the Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople from the ninth century, we find it as an ephymnion in the last antiphon of the "asmatic" Lamp-lighting and of the "asmatic" Matins (see a note on June 4: "a double 'Alleluia' is chanted for the last one,"[801] and on September 21: "the last 'Alleluia' is said twice"[802]), in the second antiphon of the service of the Trithektē "on fasting days,"[803] in the

793. "εἰς ἱερέα τελευτήσαντα."
794. "Κύριος ποιμαίνει με..."
795. "Τοῦ Κυρίου ἡ γῆ..."
796. "Ὡς ἀγαπητὰ τὰ σκηνώματά σου..."
797. "Ἀλληλούϊα ἐκ β'."
798. "ἁπλοῦν."
799. "διπλοῦν."
800. "τριπλοῦν Ἀλληλούϊα."
801. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:304.
802. This text does not appear for September 21 in Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:40.
803. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:323. Also known as the "τριτοέκτη," for studies of the Trithektē, see: M. Arranz, "Les prières presbytérales

second antiphon of the Vespers of Theophany,[804] in the third antiphon of the service for November 6 (commemoration of the "rain of ashes"),[805] in the procession of the Indiction (September 1),[806] and in the procession of November 11 (founding day of Constantinople).[807]

In the funeral service for priests, this ancient taxis survives, as well as other archaic elements (chanting of the idiomela and the exaposteilarion with verses from the psalms), obviously because it is not used as often as the corresponding common funeral service. Certainly, its first part has a visible archaic "asmatic" framework (a sequence of antiphons and readings) while the second by contrast clearly has a monastic origin (canon, lauds, idiomela, aposticha).

Since the "double Alleluia" is encountered in processions, in the Trithektē of the fasts, in the service of November 6, and even on the eve of Theophany, it could be considered proper to days of "penitence"[808] and, for this reason, was also chosen for the funeral service of priests. However, we encounter it, as we saw, also in the last antiphon of the daily "asmatic" Vespers and Matins. Moreover, generally, the chanting of the "Alleluia" cannot be considered as an element of mourning, despite the commonly prevailing differing

---

de la Tritoekti de l'ancien Euchologe byzantin," *OCP* 43 (1977): 70–93, 335–354; Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Ἀκολουθίαι τοῦ Νυχθημέρου*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 1' (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 11–44.

804. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:180–181.

805. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:92–93. This rain of ashes on Constantinople is dated November 6, 472 and was produced by an eruption of Mount Vesuvius, (Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:90–91). For a discussion of volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, and their effects on the Typikon of the Great Church, see Brian Croke, "Two Early Byzantine Earthquakes and their Liturgical Commemoration," *Byzantion* 51 (1981): 122–147; Mark Roosien, "The Liturgical Commemoration of Earthquakes in Late Antique Constantinople: At the Intersection of Ritual, Environment, and Empire (PhD diss., The University of Notre Dame, 2018); Antti Arjava, "The Mystery Cloud of 536 CE in the Mediterranean Sources," *DOP* 59 (2005): 73–94; Glanville Downey, "Earthquakes at Constantinople and Vicinity, A.D. 342–1454," *Speculum* 30 (1955): 596–600; and Emanuela Guidoboni, *Catalogue of ancient earthquakes in the Mediterranean area up to the 10th century* (Bologna: Istituto Nationale di Geofisica, 1994).

806. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:6–8.

807. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:96–97.

808. "στὶς ἡμέρες 'τῆς κατανύξεως'."

view because of its present-day use during the weekdays of Great Lent. Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki when explaining the chanting of the "Alleluia" as an ephymnion of the first stasis/antiphon of the amōmos[809] during the common funeral service attributes to it a more resurrectional than funereal character: "'Alleluia,' which signifies 'the Lord is coming,' represents his second coming, in which when appearing He will raise up all of us who have died" (*Dialogue*, chapter 366).[810]

I do not think that perhaps some theoretical or symbolic reason can be sought that dogmatically justifies the use of the double "Alleluia," which regarding its triple repetition certainly exists in honor of the Holy Trinity. It is due rather to seeking more variety in the use of this beloved sacred ephymnion (one, two, three, nine, twelve times).

## 453

**During Matins, some priests are accustomed to cense during the lauds and not during the "More honorable."[811] Is this correct?**

The censing during Matins normally takes place during the chanting of the "More honorable" or the ninth ode of the canon of the feast. In vigils of great feasts, apart from the ninth ode, the censing is also provided for at the beginning of the canon (Philotheos Kokkinos, *Diataxis of Hierodeaconship*),[812] but during Pascha and Renewal Week, at all odes of the canon.

Obviously, this is a survival of the Judaic practice, which provided for an offering of incense in every morning service at the altar of incense that was found in the "sanctuary" of the temple of Jerusalem—and the tabernacle of witness—before the curtain, which divided it from the "holy of holies" (see Exod 30:5–10). This was associated with Rev 8:3–4, where mention is made regarding the incense and the prayers of the saints ("And another angel came and stood at the altar with a golden censer; and there was given to him much incense to give it with the prayers of all the saints upon the golden altar

809. Psalm 118.
810. PG 155:684a–684b.
811. "Τὴν τιμιωτέραν."
812. PG 154:764c.

before the throne; and the smoke of the incense rose with the prayers of the saints from the hand of the angel before God").[813] We have a parallel practice of offering incense during Matins also in other liturgical forms: The Roman, the Ambrosian, the Syriac, and the Coptic.

It is not easy for anyone to answer with certainty regarding what correlation led to the connection of incense and canons, and especially the ninth ode of the Theotokos. The above passage of Revelation perhaps gives us the key. The canon is the part of the Matins, in which the saint or saints whose commemoration is celebrated on that day are predominantly praised. Indeed, if this is the reason for connecting censing and canon, then the choice of the ninth ode can also be explained because of the special honor for the Panagia. However, perhaps also practical reasons contributed, namely, the fact that in comparison with other odes, the chanting of the ninth lasted longer, since the ode of the Theotokos was originally chanted with the ephymnion/heirmos "More Honorable..." at its each verse and then the ode of Zacharias ("Blessed be the Lord God of Israel...")[814] was intoned with the troparia of the ninth ode of the canon. This also ensured the required time for the censing. The censing is not precluded to have been associated with the ode of Zacharias, the father of the Forerunner, which constitutes the second part of the ninth ode, from the obvious appeal of the narrative of the Gospel according to Luke (1:8–23), and to have been extended from there, also to the whole ninth ode. In the Roman liturgical form, the censing of the Matins takes place, for the above reason, at "Blessed be the Lord...." Moreover, many prayers of incense refer to the acceptable incense of Zacharias (for example, see the prayer of censing the entrance of the synaxis of the Liturgy of Iakōvos the Brother of God: "O God, you received...the incense of Zacharias"[815] and the prayer

813. The translation was modified from RSV to reflect the literal meaning of the text more accurately.

814. "Εὐλογητὸς Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ..."

815. "Ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ προσδεξάμενος... Ζαχαρίου τὸ θυμίαμα."

of the proskomidē of the same liturgy: "that you shall receive...the incense of Zacharias"[816]).[817]

However, many old-time priests, who follow the fairly widespread unwritten local tradition (as far as anyone can confirm), cense during lauds. They cite not only their local tradition, but also serious practical reasons. The temples of parishes are usually big and, according to the taxis, the sanctuary, the icons, the whole temple, the people, and, if they exist, the side chapels and the women's sections,[818] are censed. This requires sufficient time, which is not covered by the chanting of the ode of the Theotokos, since as is well known, the stichologia of the ode of Zacharias and the ninth ode of the canon are commonly omitted. And when a deacon participates, something exceptionally rare, the censing can comfortably take place and the synaptē before lauds can be said by him, if he has enough time, or by the priest, as also the taxis of the Great Church provides for. However, when the priest is by himself, he must either restrict the censing to the central part of the temple or rush (a disorderly act) or say the synaptē wherever he may find himself (an impropriety). The difficulty becomes even greater during the feasts, when only the ninth ode of canons is chanted, and especially during Great Week, where also many people attend church and the ninth ode has minimal and often brief troparia, which for economy of time are chanted only one time. In contrast, in the monasteries, both the temples are usually smaller and the entire ninth ode is chanted, and the troparia are doubled and chanted more elaborately.

---

816. "ὡς προσεδέξω... Ζαχαρίου τὸ θυμίαμα."

817. B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 50, 80.

818. "οἱ γυναικωνίτες." Also translated, "women's gallery." On the history of such sections in Byzantine temples, see Robert F. Taft, "Women at Church in Byzantium: Where, When–and Why?" *DOP* 52 (1998): 27–87 and Valerie A. Karras, "The Liturgical Functions of Consecrated Women in The Byzantine Church," *Theological Studies* 66 (2005): 96–116. For a description of an Orthodox temple in Greece with such a section, see Ἀγαθονίκη Δ. Τσιλιπάκου, "Ὁ Ναὸς τοῦ Ἁγίου Νικολάου στὸ Παλαιὸ Ζερβοχώρι Ἡμαθίας," *Μελετήματα Ἡμαθίας* 3 (2011): 105–174.

The censing of the temple and all the people during Matins is not something secondary, and for this reason it must take place with due decorum and orderliness. The amount of importance, which our ecclesiastical tradition assigns to it, is shown not only by the detailed instructions on the way to cense, which exist in the *Diataxis of Hierodeaconship* by Patriarch Philotheos and in Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki (*Dialogue*, chapter 350), but also by the theological significance that the Fathers attribute to it, whether it takes place during Matins or in other sacred rites. All, beginning with the author of the works that are attributed to Dionysios the Areopagite, emphasize its sacredness, since it begins and ends in the sanctuary ("The hierarch, after completing a sacred prayer in the sanctuary, starting to cense from it, goes throughout the sacred place; returning to the altar..." *Concerning Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, 3.2).[819] They consider the incense a symbol of prayer, communicating the grace and the fragrance of the Holy Spirit, a provider of sanctification, a symbol of divine love. We quote below some of the more characteristic pertinent passages of the Fathers who explain divine worship: "The censer demonstrates the humanity of Christ, the fire His Divinity, and the fragrant smoke reveals the fragrance of the Holy Spirit which precedes. For the censer denotes 'most sweet joy.' The incense...the pure prayer of good works, comes from the fragrance, just as the apostle says, 'we are the fragrance of Christ,'[820] The final censing [represents] the grace of the Holy Spirit, which was given by infusion after the Resurrection" (Germanos of Constantinople, *Mystical Contemplation*).[821] "When set in motion, the censer with the incense represents the grace of the Holy Spirit" (Pseudo-Sōphronios of Jerusalem, *Oration Containing All Ecclesiastical History*).[822] "The

819. PG 3:425b.

820. 2 Cor 2:15.

821. Adapted from Paul Meyendorff, trans., *St. Germanus of Constantinople, On the Divine Liturgy* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984), 79–81.

822. *Λόγος περιέχων τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἅπασαν ἱστορίαν καὶ λεπτομερῆ ἀφήγησιν πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ ἱερουργίᾳ τελουμένων* (*Oration containing all ecclesiastical history and a detailed narration of all performed in the Divine Sacred-Service*), PG 87:3997c. The quotation above, "Ὁ θυμιατὸς μετὰ θυμιάματος κινούμενος, τὴν χάριν δηλοῖ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος," is an adaptation of the *Patro-*

priest censes, signifying the imparting of the Holy Spirit at the time of prayer for those entering the temple. For he says, 'Grant incense for the prayers of the saints'" (Markos Eugenikos, *Explanation of the Church's Daily Office*).[823] "By the incensing which begins from the altar [is signified] the distributive and fragrant grace of the Spirit...a symbol of divine love, given to all and the fragrance of the Spirit" (Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Explanation*, 19, 25).[824] "[The incense] represents the fragrance and holiness of the Spirit, who washed clean every foul smell from sin."[825] "Therefore, the incense sanctifies the aēr, and our sense of smell and breathing, since it is also distributing the fragrance, by a certain form, gushing forth the smell to all through fire. For which reason, it symbolizes the Holy Spirit because it is also only in Him, He both dispenses the gifts and through Him all partake of the charisms. For which reason also when dedicating this to God, the hierarch also while sealing[826] thus says, 'Incense we offer to you, O Christ God, who accepting send down upon us the grace of the All-holy Spirit.'"[827] "As a cloud, the incense not only represents the Holy Spirit, but also the distributing of His Divine grace and fragrance."[828] "Incense is offered to God, beginning from the sanctuary and altogether filling the temple to the glory of God and providing our sanctification, because divine grace is bestowed

---

*logia Graeca* text, "Ὁ δὲ θυμιατὸς, ὁ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τοῦ Ἀλληλούϊα μετὰ θυμιάματος κινούμενος, τὴν χάριν δηλοῖ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος" (When set in motion at the time of the Alleluia, the censer with the incense represents the grace of the Holy Spirit). According to René Bornert, this liturgical commentary falsely attributed to Sōphronios (possibly Saint Sōphronios of Jerusalem, r. 633–638), most likely dates to the twelfth century, but not later than the thirteenth or earlier than the eleventh. Although variously titled, the manuscript contained in *Vaticanus Ottobonianus 459* was the basis for its publication in Migne, PG 87:3981b–4001b. Phountoulēs most likely referenced this edition. For a discussion of the commentary, see René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966), 210–211.

823. Saint Markos Eugenikos, *Ἐξήγησις ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας* [*Explanation of the Church's Daily Office*] (PG 160:1176c).

824. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 95, 97.

825. PG 155:224b (*Dialogue*, chapter 62).

826. Blessing with the sign of the cross.

827. PG 155:344d (*Dialogue*, chapter 133).

828. PG 155:456d (*Dialogue*, chapter 309).

to us from Him who is praised."[829] "When the priest signifies the divine glory and grace which is provided by an angel and that the house of the Lord is full of glory,"[830] "Being with censer and incense [during the entrance of Vespers] for a symbol of the taxis from above, of the distribution of divine grace from the sanctuary, and of our prayer being dedicated upward as sweet-smelling and pure incense"[831] (Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Dialogue*, chapters 62, 133, 309, 332, 347).

During the period of Tourkokratia,[832] another simpler and more popular symbolism emerges, obviously influenced by the use of incense during the ode for the Theotokos, perhaps also during the "Especially..."[833] of the Divine Liturgy. And this attempts in this manner to highlight the importance and sacredness of the censing. We add the pertinent excerpt from the *Second Teaching* 1 of Saint Kosmas Aitōlos, "The censer signifies our Lady Theotokos. The coal is inside the censer and does not burn; thus also, the Lady Theotokos accepted Christ and was not burned, but indeed was illuminated. The incense signifies the All-holy Spirit; the cover of the censer signifies the protection of the Holy Spirit; the three chains signify the Holy Trinity; the bells signify the teaching of the holy Apostles. And thus, the priest censes the groom [this is regarding the service of marriage] and teaches him by his saying: 'I worship this and if you also wish to be an Orthodox Christian, worship this as well.' And thus, both he and the priest bow and worship. This is what the incense means" (I. Menounos, *Kosmas Aitōlos, Teachings*, Athens 1979, p. 195).[834]

---

829. PG 155:600a (*Dialogue*, chapter 332).

830. "Τὴν θείαν δόξαν καὶ χάριν δι' ἀγγέλου χορηγουμένην τοῦ ἱερέως σημαίνοντος καὶ ὅτι πλήρης δόξης ὁ οἶκος Κυρίου," PG 155:624d (*Dialogue*, chapter 347). The modification of the text by Phoutoulēs is the following: "Τὴν θείαν δόξαν καὶ χάριν δι' ἀγγέλου χορηγουμένων, τοῦ ἱερέως, σημαίνοντος (τοῦ θυμιάματος), [missing 'καί'] ὅτι πλήρης δόξης ὁ οἶκος Κυρίου."

831. PG 155:629d (*Dialogue*, chapter 347).

832. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

833. "Ἐξαιρέτως..."

834. Ἰωάννης Μενοῦνος, *Κοσμᾶς ὁ Αἰτωλός: Διδαχὲς καὶ Βιογραφία* (Ἀθῆναι: Τῆνος, 1979), 195. Translation based on Nomikos Michael Vaporis, ed. and

All these points show that the course of action which the old-time priests followed, even though perhaps they had not read the high theological explanations of the Fathers, was born of their experience and piety and not a result of ignorance or indifference regarding the observance of correct taxis. I think that if the grounds above are sufficient, it is preferable for the Matins censing to be done by the priest comfortably and with due attention and piety during lauds, rather than hastily and imperfectly during the ninth ode.

## 454

**While all prayers have their exclamations, why does the prayer of the Divine Liturgy, "Hearken, O Lord Jesus Christ... ,"[835] alone not have one?**

The determination that the prayer "Hearken, O Lord Jesus Christ..." lacks an exclamation is without doubt accurate. Whether now this one prayer alone (of the countless numbers that at times have been written) does not have an exclamation, it would be a little difficult to confirm. In any case, from what anyone can know, if the prayer above is not the only one, it must be one of the rare exceptions. Prayers are always ended with a doxological conclusion, which relates the doxology to the Holy Trinity, "to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit"[836] or in a more ancient form "to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit,"[837] usually in connection with the prayers'

---

trans., *Father Kosmas, the apostle of the poor: The life of St. Kosmas Aitōlos, together with an English translation of his teaching and letters* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1977), 79. Saint Kosmas Aitōlos (Κοσμᾶς ὁ Αἰτωλός) (1714–1779), a hieromonk, who travelled throughout the areas of modern Greece and Albania from 1759 until his execution by the Ottoman authorities, is often credited as being one of the foremost Orthodox missionaries in the Balkans during the modern period. He is also attributed prophecies and teachings that have had an enduring influence within the Greek-speaking Orthodox churches. For a discussion of his prophecies, see Marios Hatzopoulos, "Eighteenth Century Greek Prophetic Literature," in *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History, Volume 13 Central and Eastern Europe 1700-1800,* ed. David Thomas and John Chesworth (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 357–377.

835. "Πρόσχες, Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ..."

836. "τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι."

837. "τῷ Πατρὶ δι' Υἱοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι."

ideas or even independent of them. These conclusions were said in an exclamatory manner (ἐκφώνως) and melodically (ἐμμελῶς) (from which also is derived "exclamation," ἐκφώνησις), and as up until the present, either the prayer was read "within earshot" (εἰς ἐπήκοον) of the people or "inaudibly" (μυστικῶς). However, even prayers, such as the prayers of "No one is worthy..."[838] of the Divine Liturgy (the priest's confession and invocation of God's mercy for his unworthiness), "O compassionate and merciful God..."[839] of holy baptism, "O Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son..."[840] of the Hagiasmos of Theophany, and so forth, which were always said inaudibly, did not lack doxological conclusions, namely, exclamations, which in these cases were also read inaudibly, just as the standard rubric distinctively notes for the prayer before the sanctification of the water of holy baptism: "one must know that [the priest] does not exclaim, but says the 'Amen' to himself." Other prayers—when later it became prevalent that they are said inaudibly at appointed points of the services—also preserved their exclamations, such as the prayers of Lamp-lighting and Matins, which are respectively said during the introductory psalm and during the Six Psalms. In a subsequent period, we encounter stray exclamations in the services, which as a strong liturgical element preserved their ancient place in the taxis of the service, while the prayers either were transferred, as the above noted prayers of Vespers and the Six Psalms, or even fell out, as the ektenēs and the plērōtika of Vespers and Matins, or even did not exist at all from the beginning, as the ektenēs for the emperor before the Six Psalms, after the litany of peace of betrothal and marriage, of the Hagiasmoi, and so forth. The thing worthy of attention in the prayer, "Hearken, O Lord Jesus Christ..." is that contrary to the above rule, the prayer was preserved, and the exclamation fell out. This compels us to accept that either it must not have had an exclamation from the beginning or, when they introduced it at this point in the Divine Liturgy from somewhere else, for certain reasons they must have left out the exclamation.

838. "Οὐδεὶς ἄξιος..."
839. "Ὁ εὔσπλαγχνος καὶ ἐλέημων Θεός..."
840. "Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, ὁ μονογενὴς Υἱός..."

The examination of the prayer's place in the Divine Liturgy and the study of its text will help us in our inquiry. In the present form of the Byzantine Liturgies of Basileios the Great and the sacred Chrysostomos, and also by their influence upon the Presanctified, we find the prayer "Hearken, O Lord Jesus Christ..." between the prayer of inclination and the exclamation, "The Holy Things are for the holy."[841] Through the influence again of the Byzantine Liturgy, we also encounter it in the Armenian Liturgy, without an exclamation, but after "The Holy Things are for the holy." In the *Codex Barberini 336*, the most ancient Byzantine Euchologion, it is entitled "Prayer for the elevation of the bread."[842] According to an ancient codex (*Pyromali* of the tenth century), the Holy Bread is elevated before the prayer and is held elevated throughout its duration, something that is also implied by the title of the prayer in the *Barberini* Euchologion. The fact that the prayer exists in both Byzantine Liturgies means that either it originally belonged only to one and its use expanded later also to the other, or that it was introduced later to both from some other Liturgy. This latter point appears more probable for the following reasons:

Unlike the ancient prayers of the Liturgies, which constitute their ancient nucleus and which are all addressed to God the Father, four are addressed to Christ and are also common to both Liturgies: "Lord, you have granted us to offer these common prayers..."[843] of the third antiphon, "Shine in our hearts, O Master who loves humankind, the pure light of your divine knowledge..."[844] before the gospel reading, "No one is worthy..." of the Cherubic hymn, and the prayer we are referencing, "Hearken, O Lord Jesus Christ...." They were subsequently introduced one way or another into the Divine Liturgies, especially since the first three at least are not mentioned by the ancient sources and are absent from quite a few old

841. "Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις..."

842. "Εὐχὴ τῆς ὑψώσεως τοῦ ἄρτου." Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Euchologio Barberini Gr. 336*, Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 19.1.

843. "Ὁ τὰς κοινὰς καὶ συμφώνους ἡμῖν χαρισάμενος προσευχάς..."

844. "Ἔλλαμψον ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, φιλάνθρωπε Δέσποτα, τὸ τῆς σῆς θεογνωσίας ἀκήρατον φῶς..."

manuscripts. They were written after the Arian and Pneumatomachian disputes and are included in the Church's effort to put forth the correct teaching regarding the person of the Lord Jesus Christ. The prayers "in consuming the Holy Elements" or "in the skeuophylakion" ("You who yourself are the fulfillment of the law..."[845] and "The mystery of your dispensation, O Christ our God, has been accomplished and perfected..."[846]), which are also themselves addressed to Christ, constitute a special case.

Despite its brevity, the prayer, "Hearken, O Lord Jesus Christ...," presents, quite a few lexical and conceptual similarities with the prayer, "No one is worthy...." As we saw, it is addressed to Christ, emphasizes the mediation of the priest, has quite an intense rhythmic speech, elevated inspiration, beautiful language, and many common elements:

1) Πρόσχες (Hearken)
— ἐπίβλεψον (look down);

2) ἐξ ἁγίου κατοικητηρίου σου (from your holy dwelling place)
— ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπαυόμενος (resting among the holy ones);

3) ἀπὸ θρόνου δόξης τῆς βασιλείας σου (from the throne of the glory of your kingdom)
— βασιλεῦ τῆς δόξης (King of Glory), δεσπότης τῶν ἁπάντων (master of all), δεσπόζεις (you reign), ὁ ἐπὶ θρόνου χερουβικοῦ ἐποχούμενος (who is borne on the Cherubic throne), βασιλεῦς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (king of Israel);

4) ἁγιάσαι (sanctify)
— ὁ μόνος ἅγιος (the only holy one), ἁγιάζων καὶ ἁγιαζόμενος (who sanctifies and who is sanctified) another reading for the exclamation;

845. "Τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ νόμου..."
846. "Ἥνυσται καὶ τετέλεσται..."

5) ὁ ἄνω τῷ Πατρὶ συγκαθήμενος (who is seated with the Father on high)
— is understood by the phrase, ὁ ἐπὶ θρόνου χερουβικοῦ ἐποχούμενος (who is borne upon the Cherubic throne);

6) καταξίωσον (deem worthy)
— ἄξιος (worthy), ἀξίωσον (deem worthy);

7) τῇ κραταιᾷ σου χειρί (by your mighty hand)
— a parallel to ἐνδεδυμένον τὴν τῆς ἱερατείας χάριν (clothed with the grace of the priesthood); and

8) τοῦ ἀχράντου σώματός σου καὶ τοῦ τιμίου αἵματος (your most pure Body and precious Blood)
— τὸ ἄχραντόν σου σῶμα καὶ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα (your most pure Body and precious Blood).[847]

After these similarities and parallels, which would sufficiently support the hypothesis that both works are from the same author, one would have also expected an exclamation, comparable with the conclusion of the prayer, "No one is worthy…," also for the prayer, "Hearken, O Lord Jesus Christ…," closely tied with the meaning of the prayer, with bold and profound antitheses just as in the exclamation of the former, which, as is well known, caused misinterpretations and dogmatic disputes during the twelfth century. Their perpetrator and casualty was the deacon of the Great Church of Constantinople, Sōtērichos Panteugenos, Patriarch-elect of Antioch, who for this reason lost the patriarchal throne.[848] The exclamation of the prayer, "No one is worthy…," is, as is well known, "For you are the one who both offers and is offered and the one who is received and is distributed [another reading: 'who sanctifies and is sanctified'], O Christ our God, and to you do we send up glory…."[849]

847. In the translation, this paragraph was reorganized for clarity.

848. Sōtērichos Panteugenos (Σωτήριχος Παντεύγενος), a twelfth-century deacon of the Great Church, defended the condemned teaching that the sacrifice of Christ was offered to the Father alone and not the other two members of the Trinity, (John Meyendorff, "Panteugenos, Soterichhos," *ODB*, 3:1574).

849. "Σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ προσφέρων καὶ προσφερόμενος καὶ προσδεχόμενος καὶ διαδιδόμενος [ἄλλη γραφή: 'ἁγιάζων καὶ ἁγιαζόμενος'], Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ σοὶ τὴν δόξαν ἀναπέμπομεν…"

Apart from the Byzantine Liturgies, the prayer, "No one is worthy," is also found in an Alexandrian Liturgy, but of Asia Minor origin, which is attributed to Grēgorios the Theologian.[850] There, this prayer is in its natural theological framework, because this whole Liturgy, in a singularly exceptional manner, is addressed to Christ and is included in the same anti-Arian effort, which we saw above. In this Liturgy, the prayer, "Hearken, O Lord...," also existed, which for the same reasons, we can say that it is also found in its original theological climate. In this Liturgy, our prayer is entitled and is "a prayer of inclination" before holy communion. In its text here, there exists the phrase "and come to sanctify us who bow our heads to you,"[851] and this is parallel with "bowing my neck"[852] of the prayer, "No one is worthy...." In addition, we find here also the sought after exclamation of the prayer: "For you are the one who breaks and who is broken and unbroken, and to you we offer up glory with the Father and the Holy Spirit, now and ever...."[853] In any case, as we expected, it presents—while connected closely with the text of the prayer and with bold profound antitheses—a precise parallel with the exclamation of the prayer, "No one is worthy..." (it lacks "[Lord] Jesus Christ our God"[854] because this exists in the address at the beginning of the prayer). All the elements show that this

850. The text of the Liturgy may be found PG 36:699–734; Γρηγόριος Μοναχὸς Ἁγιορείτης, ed., *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Πατρὸς ἡμῶν Γρηγορίου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Θεολόγου* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἱερὰ Μονὴ Πεντέλης, 1971); and Παντελεήμων (Χρυσοφάκης) τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης, *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Πατρὸς ἡμῶν Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἱ. Μητρ. Θεσσαλονίκης, 1981). See also the edition of Phountoulēs, "Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου. Εἰσαγωγικὰ προβλήματα," in *Χρονικὰ Συνεδρίων: Μνήμη ἁγίων Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου καὶ Μεγάλου Φωτίου ἀρχιεπισκόπων Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Συμπόσιο τοῦ Κέντρου Βυζαντινῶν Ἐρευνῶν, Θεσσαλονίκη 14-17 Ὀκτωβρίου 1993* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἀριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, 1994). For a discussion of this Liturgy and basic secondary references for the anaphora, see Παναγιώτης Ἱ. Σκαλτσῆς, "Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου," *Ὁ Ἑφημέριος* 61 (2012): 7–10.

851. "καὶ ἐλθὲ εἰς τὸ ἁγιάσαι ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἐπικλίναντας σοι."

852. "κλίνας τὸν ἐμαυτοῦ αὐχένα."

853. "Σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ κλῶν καὶ ὁ κλώμενος καὶ ὁ ἄκλαστος καὶ σοὶ τὴν δόξαν ἀναπέμπομεν σὺν τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεί...."

854. "[Κύριε] Ἰησοῦ Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν."

was the ancient position of the prayer, "Hearken, O Lord...," and of the exclamation that we are seeking. Obviously, the Byzantine Liturgies borrowed these two beautiful prayers from the Liturgy of Saint Grēgorios, first perhaps the Liturgy of Basileios the Great, and for this reason, in the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos the Brother of God, the prayer "No one is worthy..." is characterized as "a prayer of the Divine Basileios."[855] Both prayers were used, more as prayers of piety, the first to duplicate and to emphasize the prayer of the proskomidē ("O Lord our God, who created us..."[856] of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great and "O Lord God, Pantokratōr, the only holy..."[857] of the Liturgy of the sacred Chrysostomos), and the second, the prayer of inclination ("O Lord God of mercies..."[858] of Basileios and "We give thanks to you invisible king..."[859] of Chrysostomos). Perhaps, also, to introduce the ancient exclamation, "The Holy Things are for the holy," in a smoother manner, which obviously caused the omission of the exclamation of the prayer.

In any case, the exclamation, "The Holy Things are for the holy," as encountered in the Byzantine Liturgies and in the ancient Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions,* was and remained also after the introduction of the prayer, "Hearken, O Lord...," completely unrelated and independent of it, and in no way could it be characterized as its exclamation. However, it contributed to the original exclamation of the prayer, "Hearken, O Lord...," being omitted, which we saw, because both in the case of the prayer, "No one is worthy...," and in the present one, the already deep-rooted system of the taxis of the Liturgy at the time of its introduction did not permit the introduction of new dynamic elements, such as exclamations.

855. B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 64.
856. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ κτίσας ἡμᾶς..."
857. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, παντοκράτωρ, ὁ μόνος ἅγιος..."
858. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν..."
859. "Εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι, βασιλεῦ ἀόρατε..."

## 455

**Is not the touching of the covered Precious Gifts during the Presanctified, when we say, "The Presanctified Holy...,"[860] actually dangerous, since indeed it is done below the aër and we cannot see? What does this covering serve, that we risk the Body of the Lord?**

The question highlights an actual technical difficulty that celebrants face during the celebration of the Presanctified. The standard rubrics of our liturgical books, which are also encountered in manuscripts from the fifteenth century onward are absolutely clear. The Holy Elements are covered with the aër and the priest inserts his hand below it and "touches"[861] or "shows"[862] the Holy Bread and exclaims, "The Presanctified Holy..."; "The priest, when the Holy Gifts have been covered [or 'when the Holy Elements are covered'], while placing his hand touches the Life-giving Bread [or 'shows the Holy Bread'] with piety and great fear and says [or 'exclaims'], 'The Presanctified Holy Elements for the holy.' Because he does not right now [or 'presently'] elevate, since it is presanctified."

Unfortunately, the old manuscripts do not have detailed standard rubrics and thus we cannot follow the course of development for the original practice up until when it reaches the form above. Moreover, the external evidence is very little. The only enlightening patristic text that has been preserved is the *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts*,[863] which is attributed to Saint Theodōros the Stoudite, but does not appear to be older than the twelfth century. Moreover, Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, who has given us a pertinent brief commentary on the Presanctified in his *Dialogue* (chapters 352–355) and dedicates five answers (55–59) to it in his *Answers* to Gabriël of Pentapolis, does not refer to the point that interests us.

860. "Τὰ προηγιασμένα ἅγια..."
861. "ἅπτεται."
862. "δεικνύει." "Showing" in the sense, here, of pointing towards or indicating.
863. "*Ἑρμηνεία τῆς θείας λειτουργίας τῶν Προηγιασμένων.*"

However, it appears that the present taxis, which is attested to, as we saw, from the fifteenth century, is a simplification of an older practice. From the *Explanation* of Saint Theodōros and from the brief standard rubrics of manuscripts from the eleventh up until the fourteenth centuries, we gather that the priest did not simply touch or show with a hand the Holy Bread but raised it below the aër. Thus, the codices *Vatican 1970* and *Athens 662* expressly provide for the elevation ("he elevates the Bread," "elevating the Bread"). The *Codex Philotheou 177* also has a special prayer "for elevating the Bread." Finally, the *Explanation* of the Stoudite describes the elevation in more detail: "The priest with the topmost veil (πέπλῳ), which is also called the aër, covers over the Gifts; but at the time of the elevation, he certainly does not raise the covering, but elevating the Bread from beneath it, he says, 'The Presanctified Holy…'; at once in this manner, the aër is removed."[864]

The rubric of the *Codex Athens 713* from the twelfth century must be characterized as transitional, according to which the priest inserts both his hands below the veil, without expressly saying that he elevates the Holy Bread: "One must know that when he is about to elevate the Holy Elements that have been covered, he inserts his hands while exclaiming."

From the above, we can conclude that a basic requirement of the liturgical taxis was for the Precious Gifts to remain covered up until the fraction.[865] This was also observed up until nowadays. Originally, the elevation also took place with the Holy Elements covered, but possibly because of the dangers and difficulties involved, it was restricted to the showing[866] of the Gifts. A greater simplification was not dared. Only in one manuscript, *Athens 757* from the sixteenth century, does the priest first uncover the Precious Gifts and afterwards exclaim. But this is an exception. The covering up until the fraction was included, as the Stoudite's *Explanation* attests, among those elements that emphasize the mourning and penitential character of the Presanctified: "For let me tell you that in the other sa-

864. PG 99:1689a.
865. "μέχρι τοῦ μελισμοῦ."
866. "δείξη." "Showing" in the sense, here, of pointing towards or indicating.

cred-services, the sacred-service is performed indisputably openly, but in this one obscurely and mournfully; for which reason also the rite is done more mystically in general…[867] For after the entrance of the Divine Gifts, the doors have been immediately shut; the priest with the topmost veil…[868] [the passage that we quoted above follows][869]…is removed. By both such and other signs, the mystical sacrifice is proclaimed and exactly performed, likewise also the Presanctified rite."[870] He highlights the difference with the complete Liturgy not that there, the Holy Bread is elevated and in the Presanctified it is not, but in the fact that in the complete Liturgy "it is raised uncovered," while here of course "covered."

In any case, with this simplification, matters were made quite easier. The covering was retained and the dangers from the elevation were avoided. Moreover, the "with piety and great fear"[871] of the manuscripts alerted the priest to the attention with which he ought to act during the showing of the Precious Body below the veil. The elevation of the Holy Bread, which according to the Fathers represents the elevation of the Lord upon the Cross (Iōannēs of Damascus, *Concerning the Body and Blood of Christ*, 5, "it is elevated in the priest's hands as the body on the cross,"[872]; Germanos of Constantinople, *Ecclesiastical History and Mystical Contemplation*, "the elevation of the Precious Body represents the elevation on the Cross and the death on it and this resurrection,"[873]; Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Explanation,* 92, "elevating the Bread represents the elevation of Jesus on the Cross," *Dialogue*, chapter 99, "the elevation of the life-bearing Bread, which symbolizes the Crucifixion of the Savior on our behalf" [874]), is done during the complete Divine Lit-

867. PG 99:1688b.

868. PG 99:1689a.

869. "The priest with the topmost veil, which is also called the aër, covers over the Gifts; but at the time of the elevation, he certainly does not raise the covering, but elevating the Bread from beneath it, he says, 'The Presanctified holy…'; at once in this manner, the aër is removed."

870. PG 99:1689a.

871. "μετ' εὐλαβείας καὶ φόβου πολλοῦ."

872. PG 95:409d.

873. PG 98:448b.

874. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 151, 255.

urgy, during which, according to the rubrics of the manuscripts and the printed editions, the priest "elevates together all the breads,"[875] and consequently there is no need for the second elevation, even "covered,"[876] during the Presanctified.

## 456

**What is the essential difference between the two Hagiasmoi, the Great and the Small?**

## 457

**Does there exist a difference between the sanctifying grace of the Small and Great Hagiasmos?**

It would perhaps not be necessary, but just in case, we will begin with the clarification that "Great Hagiasmos"[877] is the Hagiasmos of Theophany, which is celebrated once a year on the day of Theophany or, according to the modern taxis, two times, during the eve and on the day of the feast, and the "Small Hagiasmos,"[878] the regular Hagiamos, which is celebrated on the first day of each month or even on any other occasion. And this is because the term, "Small Hagiasmos," is often badly used for denoting the Hagiasmos of the eve, which is nothing but the Great Hagiasmos of Theophany, where its celebration, for more practical reasons, came to be done two times. We have written repeatedly regarding this subject (see mainly the answers to questions 126[879] and 208). The questions above refer to the difference that exists between the "Great Hagiasmos" of Theophany and the "Small Hagiasmos" of the first days of the months.

To call for strictly marked boundaries in such liturgical subjects, as much as our practical logic requires it, is not completely possible. In divine worship, we have many similar sanctifying practices that impart divine grace to the faithful, and, depending on their receptivity and their faith, bestow upon them various spiritual gifts,

875. "ὑψοῖ ὅλους ὁμοῦ τοὺς ἄρτους."
876. "ἐπικεκαλλυμμένως."
877. "μέγας ἁγιασμός."
878. "μικρὸς ἁγιασμός."
879. Incorrectly identified as 128 in the Greek text.

sanctification, purification, spiritual and physical health, blessings, remission of sins, and strength; in one word, salvation. For us to specify precisely what each one offers and how each one differs from the other is somewhat scholastic and foreign to the spiritual categories that guide the Church's effort to sanctify its members and to support them in progress and salvation in Christ. For example, the questions above could be widened, without the possibility of clear solutions, in what differs the sanctifying grace of the antidōron from the bread of the Artoklasia or the hypsōma of the Panagia or of the bread that is blessed for those sick to partake (such a blessing also exists), or again what does the anointing (or even drinking) of the oil confer differently from the Artoklasia or from the lamp of the saint or from the "exorcised" oil (see the phrase from the prayer of its blessing, "or also they partake of it"[880]) and how does one have an advantage over the other.

In any case, generally, we must not seek the correct answer to our questions from how the piety of the people understands every single sanctifying practice, who also can misunderstand it or exaggerate it or even associate it with expressions sometimes foreign to Christianity. Nor again do we trust theological explanations, which perhaps are beautiful and dogmatically correct, but attempt to impose prefabricated theories on liturgical forms. The correct route leads to the explanation of worship through worship itself, the texts of prayers in the Hieratika, the diaconal petitions, and the standard rubrics, which express "the goal of the Church," as Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki says and does in his explanations ("it is possible to perceive from what is sung...this is...the goal of the Church," *Explanation,* 94).[881]

With these presuppositions, if we face the two questions above, which essentially are the same, we should seek the answer in the text of these services themselves and in the standard rubrics that accompany them. In the first place, their similarity is apparent, since sanctification of water takes place in both and since indeed from the history of our worship it is well known that the Hagiasmos of The-

880. "ἢ καὶ μεταλαμβάνουσιν ἐξ' αὐτοῦ."

881. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika,* 150–151.

ophany morphologically influenced the service of the Small Hagiasmos. The former has a strong dominical[882] character, since it takes place in remembrance of the Lord, while the second theoretically has one of the Mother of God, as it appears mainly from its hymnography, which gives to it the form of a supplication to the Theotokos or of a brief Matins of the Mother of God. In the litany of peace of both, it is sought for waters to be sanctified through the visitation of the Holy Spirit and for them to acquire a power purifying, healing, averting of the plots from adverse powers, and illuminating. Again, in these prayers for sanctification, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, at that point where, in imitation of the prayer of the Divine Liturgy's anaphora, the fruits of the sacred rite are recapitulated, in the Great Hagiasmos it is sought for the water to become "a source of incorruption, a gift of sanctification, a remission of sins, a protection against disease, a destruction to demons, inaccessible to the adverse powers and filled with angelic strength; that all who draw from it and partake of it may have it for the cleansing of their soul and body, for the healing of their passions, for the sanctification of their dwellings, and for every purpose that is expedient,"[883] and after the second invocation more concisely the water of the Hagiasmos will grant to the faithful "sanctification, health, cleansing, and blessing."

During the Small Hagiasmos's prayers for sanctification, God's grace through the partaking of and sprinkling with the sanctified water provides the blessing that "wipes off" the "pollutions of the passions" and heals sicknesses and "the diseases of both soul and body" (prayer, "O Lord our God, who is mighty in counsel..."),[884] or the blessing and the grace of healing are sent down upon the water, so that we are granted through it relief "from both spiritual infirmities and physical suffering" for "healing of both soul and body" (prayer, "O great and most high God...").[885]

882. "δεσποτικό."

883. Adapted from the translation of Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos Ware, eds. and trans., *The Festal Menaion* (London: Faber and Faber, 1969), 356.

884. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ μέγας τῇ βουλῇ..."

885. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ μέγας καὶ ὕψιστος..."

Despite the common elements above, it is easy for anyone to perceive that the emphasis in the Small Hagiasmos is given more to the healing of bodily and spiritual sicknesses, while in the Great Hagiasmos the above entreaty is integrated, along with other similar ones, into the dominant theme of the blessing of the nature of the waters through the Baptism of the Lord. The sanctification of the waters of Theophany is a real "event" for the life of the Church, a remembrance and real liturgical presence of the saving event of the Baptism of the Lord with the whole weight of its consequences on the life of every believer apart also from the entire body of the Church. It is well known that the sanctification of the water during Theophany was precisely the sanctification of the water of holy baptism, in which the cross was first immersed, in a representation of the Baptism of the Lord, and then, after the faithful drew the water for drinking and blessing, the catechumens were baptized in it. In other words, the sanctified water of the Great Hagiasmos is this "species," according to doctrinal terminology, of the mystery of baptism, the second great mystery of the Church after the Holy Eucharist. For this reason, a great honor is also attributed to it, the "saving water," as Saint Kyrillos of Jerusalem called it (*Mystagogic Catechesis* 2.4).[886] And it is certainly not correct for its drinking to be compared with Holy Communion, namely, the partaking of the Body and Blood of the Lord, as lay piety tends to believe, but in any case, the water of baptism consecrated with the invocation of the Holy Spirit is the second only to this most sacred mystical species.

We can precisely conclude this also from the standard rubrics that accompany these services and determine the time for the celebration and drinking of these two Hagiasmoi. The Small Hagiasmos is celebrated after the end of the Divine Liturgy and the distribution and consumption of the antidōron, namely, the breaking of the eucharistic fast through the consumption of the antidōron. The Great Hagiasmos is celebrated and is drunk after the prayer behind the ambōn and before the distribution and consumption of

886. Kyrillos of Jerusalem, *Mystagogic Catechesis* 2, 4 in *Cyrille de Jérusalem, Catéchèses Mystagogiques*, ed. Auguste Piédagnel and trans. Pierre Paris, SC 126 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966), 112.

the antidōron, namely, before the breaking of the eucharistic fast. A lengthy standard rubric characteristically synopsizes this taxis, which is encountered, with variations, in different manuscripts. We quote it according to the *Codex Sinai 1096* from the twelfth century: "After the partaking of the Divine Mysteries, kataklaston[887] is not given, nor is a psalm said, but tapers are given to the brethren, and the priest says, 'Arise. Having partaken,'[888] then, 'For you are our sanctification,'[889] and we, 'Amen,' and we chant the troparion in the plagal of the fourth tone, 'The voice of the Lord,'[890] three times. And while this is chanted, we go to the baptistery[891]...And all being baptized by the water sprinkled and drunk, they enter the temple chanting, 'When you were baptized in the Jordan, O Lord.'[892] Then, the priest, 'Let us go forth in peace. Let us pray to the Lord,'[893] and he says the prayer behind the ambōn. Then he says the psalm and we receive the kataklaston." Later rubrics put the celebration of the Great Hagiasmos before the prayer behind the ambōn. The "Blessed be the name of the Lord..."[894] and the dismissal remain unchanged after the celebration, the sprinkling, and the drinking of the Hagiasmos. For example, the Typikon of the Monastery of the Evergetis (*Athens 788* from the twelfth century) is extremely clear: "And after the priest says the prayer behind the ambōn, neither the blessing being given, nor the usual psalm, 'I will bless the Lord,'[895] being said, all go into the bath...when all are sanctified by and partake of the sharing and sprinkling of the Hagiasmos...we enter the temple... immediately the blessing is given, while we say Psalm 33, 'I will bless the Lord.'"[896] But also, our contemporary Typika, which obvi-

887. "κατακλαστόν, τό" namely, antidōron, but normally the portion used by the priest to excise the particles for the living and those "fallen asleep."

888. "Ὀρθοὶ μεταλαβόντες..."

889. "Ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ ἁγιασμὸς ἡμῶν."

890. "Φωνὴ Κυρίου."

891. "φωτιστῆρα."

892. "Ἐν Ἰορδάνῃ βαπτιζομένου σου, Κύριε."

893. "Ἐν εἰρήνῃ προέλθωμεν. Τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."

894. "Εἴη τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου εὐλογημένον..."

895. "Εὐλογήσω τὸν Κύριον."

896. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, September to February*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Transla-

ously mistakenly transfer the Great Hagiasmos after, "Blessed be the name...,"[897] still also remain faithful to the ancient tradition, which in this way expresses in practice the priority of the Great Hagiasmos over antidōron.

The retrospection into the texts and standard rubrics of both services of Hagiasmoi clearly showed, I think, "the goal of the Church" for them. Despite the similarities, the superiority of the Hagiasmos of Theophany over the Hagiasmos of the first days of the months is apparent, so much that the traditional characterization of the first as "Great," and the second as "Small" Hagiasmos, is justified.

## 458

**After the burial of the deceased, is it correct for an Hagiasmos in connection with the Trisagion to take place in the home of the deceased, as is customary, and what is the purpose of this?**

From what I know, an Hagiasmos in the home of the deceased after his/her burial is not provided for either by our printed liturgical books or by the manuscripts but is a custom quite widespread according to region. In many places, it is customary that the priest returns to the home of the deceased, to pay his respects to the mourners, and to bless and to sit at the table according most ancient and gracious tradition. At that time, before the table or after it, the Hagiasmos is also celebrated. This is certainly a folk custom, which facilitates the contact of the priest with the suffering family, within a very composed atmosphere, which can be a source of blessings and a consolation for the bereaved.

The fact that this Hagiasmos is without doubt a survival of pre-Christian purification and apotropaic[898] practices, which followed the burial of and contact with the dead, has no special significance. The Christian Church faced such popular customs with much wisdom and understanding, many of which it adopted formally or informally, but after giving them a new theological/Christian content. If then this custom exists, I do not see the reason for

tions, 6.5 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2000), 414–419.

897. "Εἴη τὸ ὄνομα..."

898. "ἀποτρεπτικῶν."

which it ought not to be maintained, with the requirement always of its best as possible pastoral utilization.

In an earlier answer (to question 218) we wrote regarding the parallel custom of celebrating a Trisagion in the home of the deceased after the funeral. There, we also quoted the text of a consoling prayer for mourners, "O Lord, the consolation of the afflicted...,"[899] which is also found in the funeral service for priests. This prayer can be used either in the service of the Hagiasmos, or the Trisagion, or instead of or parallel to the ancient marvelous prayer, "O God of spirits...."[900] The prayer, "O Lord, the consolation of the afflicted...," both as a suitable prayer and as a starting point for consoling words by the priest, can assist very much in alleviating the pain of the mourners and in making more fervent their hope in life after death and in the awaited resurrection from the dead.

---

899. "Κύριε, ἡ τῶν θλιβομένων παραμυθία..." The full text of the prayers, as published in *Νεκρώσιμοι καὶ ἐπιμνημόσυνοι ἀκολουθίαι* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 1998), 94:

> Κύριε, ἡ τῶν θλιβομένων παραμυθία καὶ τῶν πενθούντων παράκλησις καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὀλιγοψυχίᾳ ἀντίληψις ὑπάρχων, τοὺς τῷ πένθει τοῦ κοιμηθέντος συνεχομένους τῇ σῇ εὐσπλαχνίᾳ παραμύθησαι· πᾶν ἄλγος ἐγκείμενον εἰς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν θεράπευσον καὶ τὸν δοῦλον σου τόνδε (τὴν δούλην σου τήνδε), ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἀναστάσεως κεκοιμημένον (ην), ἐν κόλποις Ἀβραὰμ ἀνάπαυσον.
>
> Σὺ γάρ εἶ ἡ ἀνάπαυσις τῶν σῶν δούλων καὶ Σοὶ τὴν δόξαν ἀναπέμπομεν, τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· Ἀμήν.

The following is a translation adapted from that provided by the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Australia (https://greekorthodox.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/GOAA-Funeral-Service-Combined.pdf, accessed May 9, 2022) for use in the burial of unbaptized infants:

> O Lord, the consolation of the afflicted, the comfort of those who mourn and the help of all who are dispirited: console, in your loving kindness, those who are grieving for the one who has "fallen asleep;" heal every pain lying on their hearts and give rest in the bosom of Abraham to this your servant who has "fallen asleep" in the hope of resurrection.
>
> For you are the repose of your servants, and to you we offer glory, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, now and ever and to the ages of ages. Amen.

900. "Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων..."

## 459

**If the priest finds himself in a camp,[901] chapel, barracks, and so forth, and wears an epitrachēlion as his only vestment, can he celebrate the Divine Liturgy?**

In one of the first answers, to question eight, we faced a similar question, but relating to the celebration of a Paraklēsis or another service without an epitrachēlion. At the time, we referred to the answer of Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki to question seventeen of Gabriēl of Pentapolis ("If it is the case that a man is ordained, what is the need for sacred vestments? And whether it is possible without an epitrachēlion to perform the sacred rite?"),[902] which gives a wonderful masterful answer to this question. Now, I quote its main part that concerns us because it is truly a unique text:

"The man who is found fit undertakes the priesthood, and sacred mysteries are effected through him who has been ordained as an instrument. However, since humanity is composed of body and soul, the mysteries also have been provided to be performed twofold and require a temple and altar for the priest. Although the Divine Loukianos once used his chest instead of an altar, when dying for Christ, and performed the sacred mysteries while captive in prison, except he also placed his disciples around him instead of a temple. For which reason also, there is a need for sacred vestments and without an epitrachēlion the priest must not do anything, since also the sacred vestments have divine grace, because each of them also has a spiritual significance and each is given through a hierarchical blessing. And in the Divine Liturgy, he must be completely vested; and in the remaining sacred rites, when this is customary, and must never abolish what exists according to tradition, even if they seem the least."[903]

If these things are valid for all the sacred services and for the celebration of the mysteries of the Church, then much more do they have application for the Divine Liturgy, regarding which Symeōn

901. Such as a summer camp for youth.
902. PG 155:868c.
903. PG 155:868c–868d.

states that "he must be completely vested." The circumstances referenced above do not justify in any way, I believe, an exception. If now there are other reasons, like the case of Saint Loukianos, such as a persecution, a shipwreck, or some other similar circumstance, God will provide enlightenment, so that a solution will be found for the sanctification and the nourishing of His people. Then, it shall be valid that "a man is ordained" and "the man…receives the priesthood," who is also the "instrument" of God for the celebration of the "sacred mysteries." However, what so emphatically Saint Symeōn articulates as generally true, is repeated with other words by the "Explanation for Priests and Deacons,"[904] which "was scrutinized" by Patriarch Kallinikos of Constantinople[905] and is appended in the printed editions of the Modern Greek translation of the works of Saint Symeōn: "Without these sacred vestments [above, he enumerates the five vestments of the priest and the three of the deacon] the priest and deacon are never able to perform the sacred mysteries; but if the priest might dare, while he completes the mystery, all the same he sins mortally and is deposed from the priesthood" (third edition, in Athens 1868, p. 460).[906]

---

904. "Ἑρμηνεία πρὸς τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ διακόνους."

905. Kallinikos III, patriarch of Constantinople (1713–1791, r. January 16–July 22, 1757). Phountoulēs is alluding to the phrase from the work's introduction, "Θεωριθεῖσα μετ᾽ ἀκριβείας" (Being scrutinized meticulously), Πολυζώης Λαμπανιτζιώτης, trans., *Τοῦ μακαρίου Συμεὼν Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης τὰ ἅπαντα εἰς τέσσερα μέρη διαιρεθέντα: ἐν οἷς περιέχονται διάλογοι ἐκκλησιαστικοί* (Leipzig: n.p., 1791), 463.

906. Πολυζώης Λαμπανιτζιώτης, trans., and Ἰωσὴφ Σκάθαρος, ed., Συμεών, Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Θεσσαλονίκης, *Τὰ ἅπαντα εἰς ἓξ' μέρη διαιρεθέντα ἐν οἷς περιέχονται… ἐκ τῆς ἀρχαίας εἰς τὴν καθομιλουμένην μετενεχθέντα ἑλληνίδα φωνὴν πρὸς ψυχωφελῆ χρῆσιν τῶν εὐλαβῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἱερέων καὶ λαϊκῶν: ἐκδίδεται ἐγκρίσει τῆς Ἱερᾶς Συνόδου τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, 3rd ed. (Ἀθῆναι: Ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου τῆς Θέμιδος, 1868), 460.

In question 39, Phountoulēs states that Polyzōēs Lampanitziōtēs or Lampanitsiōtēs (Πολυζώης Λαμπανιτζιώτης or Λαμπανιτσιώτης), born 1726 Ioannina–death 1799 Venice, is the author of the "Explanation for Priests and Deacons" (Ἑρμηνεία πρὸς τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ διακόνους). However, Vasileios Tsakirēs attributes the authorship of the this writing to Kallinikos III of Constantinople (1713–1791, r. January 16–July 22, 1757), see Βασίλειος Τσακίρης, "Προσθῆκες στὴν ἑλληνικὴ βιβλιογραφία, Νέα Στοιχεία γιὰ τὰ δύο ἔντυπα ἔργα τοῦ Πατριάρχη Καλλίνικου Γ'," *Ὁ Ἐρανιστής* 27 (2009): 253–258 (https://

## 460

**Who should do the consumption of the Holy Elements, the priest or the deacon?**

## 461

**Can a priest who did not serve consume the Holy Elements?**[907]

According to the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos of Constantinople (*Codex Panteleēmonos 6277-770* from the fourteenth century), the Holy Elements are consumed

---

ejournals.epublishing.ekt.gr/index.php/eranistis/article/view/1460/1459, accessed September 17, 2021). For further information on the Polyzōēs Lampanitziōtēs (or Lampanitsiōtēs), see Π. Παναγιωτίδης, "Πολυζώης ὁ Λαμπανιτσιώτης καὶ αἱ ἐκδόσεις αὐτοῦ," *Ἑλληνικὸς Φιλολογικὸς Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* 27 (1900): 325–328, who favors the spelling of the name with a "σ" in place of the "ζ" based on its geographical origin; and Στέφανος Μπέττης, "Πολυζώης Λαμπανιτσιώτης, ὁ μεγαλύτερος ἕλληνας ἐκδότης τοῦ ΙΗ' αἰώνα," *Ἠπειρωτικὴ Ἑστία* 16 (1967): 499–523.

In the text of this modern Greek translation of Saint Symeōn's writings, the title of this appendix has two variations; the one cited by Phountoulēs as, "Ἑρμηνεία πρὸς τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ διακόνους," and the other, "Ἑρμηνεία εἰς τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ διακόνους," see Πολυζώης Λαμπανιτζιώτης, trans., and Ἰωσὴφ Σκάθαρος, ed., Συμεών, Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Θεσσαλονίκης, *Τὰ ἅπαντα εἰς ἓξ' μέρη διαιρεθέντα ἐν οἷς περιέχονται... ἐκ τῆς ἀρχαίας εἰς τὴν καθομιλουμένην μετενεχθέντα ἑλληνίδα φωνὴν πρὸς ψυχωφελῆ χρῆσιν τῶν εὐλαβῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἱερέων καὶ λαϊκῶν: ἐκδίδεται ἐγκρίσει τῆς Ἱερᾶς Συνόδου τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, 3rd ed. (Ἀθῆναι: Ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου τῆς Θέμιδος, 1868), 439, 512. However, on the general title page, the title of this appendix also appears as, "Διδασκαλία πρὸς τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ διακόνους." This same title ("Διδασκαλία πρὸς τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ διακόνους") also appears on the general title page of the 1791 first edition and is used as the title in the appendix, Πολυζώης Λαμπανιτζιώτης, trans., *Τοῦ μακαρίου Συμεὼν Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης τὰ ἅπαντα εἰς τέσσερα μέρη διαιρεθέντα: ἐν οἷς περιέχονται διάλογοι ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ ἀρχιερέως καὶ κληρικοῦ... νῦν πρῶτον ἐκ τῆς Ἑλληνίδος μετενεχθέντα εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν ἁπλοελληνικὴν διάλεκτον πρὸς ψυχωφελῆ χρῆσιν πάντων τῶν εὐλαβῶν ὀρθοδόξων, ἱερέων τε καὶ λαϊκῶν, καὶ μεθ' ὅσης ἀκριβῶς ἐπιμελείας διορθωθέντα.* (Leipzig: n.p., 1791), 463. However, in this first edition, the word, "Ἑρμηνεία," is the first word of the text in this appendix.

907. See also question 591. For another viewpoint on this question, see Robert F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Vol. VI, The Communion, Thanksgiving and Concluding Rites*, OCA 281 (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2008), 720–752.

by the concelebrating deacon, "with every attentiveness and caution."[908] The manuscripts of the Divine Liturgy also repeat the same thing, which often incorporate verbatim the pertinent phrases of the *Diataxis*. An older brief *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* (*Codex Athens 662* from the twelfth/thirteenth centuries) agrees with the *Diataxis* of Philotheos: "[The priest] going out distributes the antidōron. The deacon departs, introduces[909] the Holy Elements, and cleanses[910] the holy vessels."[911] The consumption took place in the diakonikon or skeuophylakion, where the sacred vessels were taken after the communion of the people, a space of the deacon's responsibility, as the ancient word, "diakonikon," denotes. The last prayer of the Divine Liturgy was formerly read there by the priest, which is entitled for this reason, "prayer in the diakonikon"[912] or "in the skeuophylakion,"[913] and "in consuming the Holy Elements."[914] Later, as also is done up until nowadays, the remains of the Holy Elements were transferred to the prothesis, where the priest also read the prayer as above and consumed the Holy Elements.

The emphasis in the above rubrics is placed not on who must do the consumption, but that this must take place with great piety and attention. The "Explanation for Priests and Deacons," to which we have also previously referred (see, recently, at the end of the answer

908. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 15.

909. "εἰσκομίζει." The word parallels the term "ἐμάξας" (a wiping action for depositing the remaining Holy Elements into the chalice) which is used to describe this action in the *Diataxis* of Philotheos, (Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 14). Also compare the use of this word in the fourteenth century *Vatopediou 135*, "*λαβὼν μετὰ χεῖρας τόν τε ἅγιον δίσκον καὶ τὴν μοῦσαν, εἰσκομίζει πάντα ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ποτηρίῳ μετὰ φόβου καὶ πάσης ἀσφαλείας, ὥστε μηδέν τι τῶν λεπτοτάτων ἐκπεσεῖν ἢ καταλειφθῆναι*" (taking with his hand both the holy paten and mousa, he introduces everything into the holy chalice with fear and every care, so that none of the finer particles fall or are remaining), *Διάταξις τῆς Θείας Λειτουργίας κατὰ τὰ Βατοπαιδινὰ Χειρόγραφα τοῦ ΙΔ' αἰῶνα* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἱερὰ Μεγίστη Μονὴ Βατοπαιδίου, 2019), 1:133. Phountoulēs himself uses the word identically in the phrasing of question 591.

910. The word "συστέλλει," is translated here as "he cleanses." This word is being used here similarly to the English expression, "consuming the chalice."

911. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 15.

912. "εὐχὴ ἐν τῷ διακονικῷ."

913. "ἐν τῷ σκευοφυλακίῳ."

914. "ἐν τῷ συστεῖλαι τὰ ἅγια."

to question 459), gives detailed guidance regarding the consumption of the Holy Elements, which the priest or deacon did, as it appears, without distinction. The responsibility for this is particularly emphasized because it is borne by the priest: "After the completion of the Divine Liturgy, the priest is obliged to do the following. Immediately after the communion of the Divine Mysteries, the priest or the deacon is obliged to combine the remnant of the Divine Body on the paten with the Divine Blood in the holy chalice and to commune of it with complete attentiveness so that even the absolutely smallest particle might not remain or fall…The priest must do so in every Liturgy, because he sins mortally…" (third edition, in Athens 1868, p. 474).[915]

In any case, the consumption of the remainders of the Holy Gifts was not done only by the priests or the deacons. There is ancient evidence preserved by the historian of the sixth century, Evagrius the Scholastic, which Nikēphoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos repeats during the fourteenth century, who reliably records the evidence from the former, as is shown from the textual similarities. This concerns the narrative of a miracle that took place during the reign of Patriarch Mēnas of Constantinople (536–552), during which a child of a Jewish family, who communed by mistake—during the consumption of the Holy Elements—of the undefiled Mysteries, was preserved safe from the fire, into which his enraged father threw him for punishment. According to this narrative, it was an old custom in Constantinople for priests to invite small children to consume the remains of the Precious Gifts: "Ancient custom in the imperial city has it that when a substantial quantity of holy portions of the immaculate Body of Christ our God remain left over, chaste boys sent for are from among those studying with an elementary school master and they consume these holy portions" (*Ecclesiastical History*

915. Πολυζώης Λαμπανιτζιώτης, trans., and Ἰωσὴφ Σκάθαρος, ed., Συμεών, Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Θεσσαλονίκης, *Τὰ ἅπαντα εἰς ἕξ' μέρη διαιρεθέντα ἐν οἷς περιέχονται… ἐκ τῆς ἀρχαίας εἰς τὴν καθομιλουμένην μετενεχθέντα ἑλληνίδα φωνὴν πρὸς ψυχωφελῆ χρῆσιν τῶν εὐλαβῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἱερέων καὶ λαϊκῶν: ἐκδίδεται ἐγκρίσει τῆς Ἱερᾶς Συνόδου τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, 3rd ed. (Ἀθῆναι: Ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου τῆς Θέμιδος, 1868), 474. The quotation is interrupted mid-sentence.

4.36).[916] While Xanthopoulos repeats the same things, adding that the priests invited the boys, who had to be fasting, nevertheless his testimony has particular worth because he also adds that when he himself was a boy, he happened to consume the Holy Elements: "Which many times when I was at a young age indeed also happened precisely to me, who indeed had taken the trouble to spend time in the sacred temples from my youth" (*Ecclesiastical History* 17. 25).[917] Namely, this practice continued up until the fourteenth century. However, odder still is the fact the custom survived up until the previous century during the Liturgy of Great Thursday. Blessed Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain in the *Rudder* (first edition 1800) severely condemns what "some ignorant priests" do, who permit laity or readers to consume the Holy Elements on Great Thursday (note to the sixty-ninth canon of the Sixth Ecumenical Council).[918]

From the above facts, I think that the conclusion can be reached that while the deacon in principle does the consumption of the Holy Elements, yet the priest also does. When there are special reasons and there is a priest who did not serve, if he is fasting, even he[919] can do the consumption of the Holy Elements.

## 462

**What significance does the use of flour have during the celebration of the mystery of unction?**

Certainly, this concerns the modernization of an old custom, which is attested to by manuscripts already from the thirteenth century onwards (for example, *Athens 573, 662, 667, S 696, M. Lavras 189*). According to the rubrics of these manuscripts, upon the table was placed "a vessel" (σκεύος) ("basin," χερνίβιον; or "plate," πινάκιον), which contained wheat (σιτάρι) ("grain," σῖτον; "wheat,"

916. Adapted from Michael Whitby, trans., *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), 241.

917. PG 147:280c–280d.

918. Ἀγάπιος Ιερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982), 281, n. 1.

919. The priest who did not serve but is fasting.

σιτάρια; "barleycorns," κριθάρια), and in the middle of the wheat they propped up an oil-lamp. This was the practical purpose that the use of the wheat served. The lamp was propped up and, in case of its being moved, the unction would not spill on the ground, but in the vessel for the wheat. Therefore, they used it also like a handy candelabra since unction was very often celebrated in homes. Seven tapers were also propped up inside it, according to the number of the priests, which according to custom they lit around the lamp. But also, the priest, after the anointing, also lit and inserted into the wheat the "wick" (θρυαλίδα) soaked in holy oil (or "lance brush," χριαλίδα, namely, "the tubular holder for a wick," τὸ ἀπτρότουρβον... φιτίλι), obviously in order not to be desecrated. The wheat was an item that was in all the homes of that era, just as nowadays the flour that replaced it. These days, with this flour, they prepare prosphoro for the Divine Liturgy, as perhaps also then.

## 463

**In marriage, where is it more correct for "Blessed is the kingdom..." to be said, with the crowns on the heads of the ones being married or on the table?**

When the mystery of marriage was connected with the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, "Blessed is the kingdom..." and the motion in the shape of the cross with the Gospel book took place on the holy table, as usual, upon which also the crowns were laid. When afterwards it was separated from the Divine Liturgy and took place, as up until the present, in the center of the temple, the holy table was replaced by the common table, upon which now the crowns of marriage and Gospel book are placed. It would be vain for us to seek evidence in later manuscripts for where "Blessed is the kingdom..." was or where it must be said. I have the opinion that the most decent thing and that most consistent with the early practice would be for it to be said upon the common table with the crowns, namely, the replacement of the holy table, rather than upon the heads of the ones about to be married, no matter how impressive the latter is. Afterwards, the Gospel book can be offered for a kiss to the ones

being married and to the best man/maid of honor, as also takes place after the reading of the gospel pericope according to age-old custom.

## 464

**During the commemoration of names at the prothesis, in the memorial services, and so forth, must the word "pilgrim" (προσκυνητής) or "pilgrimess" (προσκυνήτρια) also be added for those who have made a pilgrimage to the Holy Places?**

In the past, a pilgrimage for anyone to the Holy Places was a very important and rare event. When motivated by much zeal, with great labor and expenditure, those who succeeded in realizing this pilgrimage considered it to be a special grace from God and always added to their names the honorific epithet "pilgrim" ("χατζῆς"). Many family names have as their root the pilgrimage of one of their ancestors to the Holy Places.[920] Nowadays, with the development of means of transportation, tourism, and an increased standard of living, travel and pilgrimage to the Holy Places have been made much easier and have become an ordinary phenomenon. A quite large number of practicing Christians are "pilgrims." It would be meaningless for the word to be repeated continually in the lists of names being commemorated. On the other hand, if the number of pilgrims in a small parish is few, and provided it is requested, its addition would not hurt.

## 465

**Why during the triple immersion and emersion of the one being baptized during the mystery of baptism do we exclaim the name of the Holy Trinity once, while during the betrothal and the mystery of marriage we betroth and crown the newlywed couple in the name of "three Trinities"[921]?**

The repetition three times of certain words, phrases, or practices in divine worship is something extremely common. The simplest ex-

920. Many Greek surnames begin with the prefix, "chatze" (χατζη).

921. "τῶν τρίων Τριάδων," namely, the repetition of the trinitarian formula three times.

planation is that it is done according to the model and in honor of the Holy Trinity, as elsewhere the opportunity has been given to us to note. Thus, "Holy" in the victory hymn and in its imitations ("Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Hosts...," Isaiah 6:3—Divine Liturgy, triadika), "Amen," "Lord have mercy," "Alleluia," and so forth, are repeated three times. For the same reason, by extension, we have triple blessings or a triple sign with the form of the cross, a triple plunging of the precious cross in water during the Hagiasmoi, a triple repetition of the confession in holy baptism or even a triple repetition of phrases and hymns, the triadika themselves (such as the trisagion hymn), "In the name of the Father...," and similar things. In these latter instances, we have a triple repetition of the names of the three persons of the Holy Trinity. The same thing also occurs for "The servant of God is betrothed...in the name..."[922] and "The servant of God is crowned...in the name..."[923] of betrothal and marriage, in sealings during ordination, the imposition of hands, monastic tonsure, and similar things.

Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, when commenting on the triple repetition of certain phrases and practices, such as the renunciation, the affirmation, the infusion, the recitation of the Symbol of Faith before baptism,[924] the triple supplication of the candidate for tonsure to the monastic schema, and the triple exchange of rings during the betrothal, is not limited only to their theological explanation, namely, the reference to the honor and the glory of the Holy Trinity, "of our only God in Trinity," or "of the trihypostatic divinity." He also uses certain words, which recall legal technical terminology: "in confirmation" (εἰς βεβαίωσιν), "for the guarantee" (διὰ τὸ βέβαιον), "confirming" (βεβαιῶν), "for security" (διὰ τὸ ἀσφαλές) (*Dialogue*, chapters 62, 269, 278).[925] It is very possible that the triple repetition of certain key words or the triple performance of symbolic practices or the triple repetition of a question/

922. "Ἀρραβωνίζεται...εἰς τὸ ὄνομα..."
923. "Στέφεται...εἰς τὸ ὄνομα..."
924. This refers to a practice for the Creed's repetition three times.
925. PG 155:217d, 492c. Although occurring in other chapters in various forms, only the first two examples are found in chapters 62 and 269 respectively.

answer actually has its origins in the provisions of Roman law, which sought the confirmation and security of certain transactions and legal acts in this way, which originally indeed were only oral. Christian theology comes afterwards to sanctify and to give spiritual meaning to this ancient custom, relating it to the Holy Trinity, "which may both accomplish and confirm everything" (Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Dialogue*, chapter 278).[926]

Especially now, I do not think that the triple repetition of "The servant of God is betrothed..." and "The servant of God is crowned..." of the question can be traced back either to the provisions of Roman law or to the old liturgical tradition of the Church. It has rather a popular basis and is done in imitation of other older similar models from an acquired, in a sense, practice. And this takes place because both the above instances cannot be older than the last centuries of the period of the Tourkokratia.[927] They are encountered, as we shall see, in only a few late manuscripts and presuppose ("The servant of God [name] is crowned for the servant of God [name]..." and "...the servant...the servant...") the later popular meaning and use of the term, "I am crowned" (στέφομαι), which replaced the correct older terms, "I espouse" (νυμφεύομαι) and "I am subject to a man" (ὑπανδρεύομαι). From the most impressive, but not theologically crucial—which is the joining of the hands and the priestly blessing that accompanies it[928]—element of the benediction of marriage, the entire service is renamed "service of crowning,"[929] but also the verb itself "I am crowned" (στέφομαι) is used in the sense of "I espouse" (νυμφεύομαι) or "I am subject to a man" (ὑπανδρεύομαι), perhaps also for reasons of decorum. Its triple repetition precisely aims to underline the importance and to stress with emphasis the tradition of the rings or the crowning of the newlyweds, corresponding with the significance that popular religiosity already gave to these elements.

926. PG 155:508d.

927. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

928. The joining of the hands and the priestly blessing are theologically crucial elements.

929. "ἀκολουθία τοῦ στεφανώματος."

A look into the history of this liturgical form will shed more light on the matter and show us the course that the tradition followed up until it reached its present shape.

Both the rings and crowns are pre-Christian symbols of betrothal and marriage. Despite the reactions of certain rigorous Christians, as it appears from evidence in the works of old authors, such as Clement of Alexandria, Minucius Felix, and Tertullian, rings and crowns are already being adopted from the third century also by the Christian Church. However, it gives to them a new theological meaning, alongside the old one. They are not only a symbol of promise, joy, and authority, but also of wedlock in Christ. The best man, "the sponsor," "who is in place of the father for them," according to Symeōn of Thessaloniki (*Dialogue*, chapter 280),[930] exchanges them instead of the father or of the mother, as was the idol-worshipping or Judaic custom, but Christ presents them through the priest from the holy table or from the Gospel book. The crowns also acquire a moral sense, already from the time of Saint Iōannēs Chrysostomos; they are a trophy of victory against the passions and a reward of chastity (*Homily 9 on the First Epistle of Timothy*).

What was said by the priest during the conveying of the rings and during the crowning? The practice, as it appears from the manuscripts, was different from place to place and from era to era. Regarding the rings, the older manuscripts make mention only of their conveying from the priest to the ones being betrothed, without saying what words accompanied it. Some speak regarding a triple blessing of the rings or of the hands of those about to be married. In the codices of *Athens S 724* and *Sinai 984* from the fourteenth–fifteenth centuries, the phrase, "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,"[931] which is only said one time, accompanies the conveying or the exchange of the rings. In slightly later manuscripts, the phrase almost acquires its present-day shape without, however, also including the two names of the ones being betrothed and without being repeated three times: "The servant of God [name]

930. PG 155:509d.

931. "Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος."

is betrothed [also, "is engaged"] in the name of the Father..."[932]; and for the woman, "The servant of God [name] is betrothed in the name of the Father..."[933] (*Athens 849, Pantokratōros 149, Sinai 984* from the fifteenth-seventeenth centuries). Among known manuscripts, it is only encountered with both the names of the betrothed ("The servant of God [name] is betrothed for the servant of God [name] in the name of the Father..."[934] and the reverse for the woman) in the *Codex Sinai 996* from the sixteenth century. Nevertheless, its triple repetition is not attested to by the manuscripts.

We find greater diversity in the crowning. It appears that the more ancient practice provided for the chanting of verse 4b from Psalm 20, "You have placed upon his head a crown—or upon their heads crowns—of precious stone,"[935] which was preserved as a prokeimenon for the epistle in the present-day service (codices of *M. Lavras 88, Patmos 689* and *715, Sinai 958* and *973* from the tenth–sixteenth centuries) or the variant verse 6b of Psalm 8 ("crown him with glory and honor")[936] in the well-known and present-day chanted form, "O Lord our God, crown them with glory and honor."[937] Both their chanting one and three times are encountered, as well as their chanting in combination with verses chosen from the psalms above. In addition, we also encounter the variant, for the man, "Lord our God...crown him [or your servant]"[938] and, for the woman, "Lord...crown her [or your servant],"[939] while the "ones who are present"[940] chanted in a third repetition, "Lord...

---

932. "Ἀῤῥαβωνίζεται [καὶ μνηστειάζεται] ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ Θεοῦ δεῖνα εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρός..."

933. "Ἀῤῥαβωνίζεται ἡ δοῦλη τοῦ Θεοῦ δεῖνα εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρός..."

934. "Ἀῤῥαβωνίζεται ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ Θεοῦ δεῖνα τὴν δούλην τοῦ Θεοῦ δεῖνα εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρός..."

935. "Ἔθηκας ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ στέφανον–ἢ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν στεφάνους–ἐκ λίθου τιμίου."

936. "δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν."

937. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ στεφάνωσον αὐτούς."

938. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν...στεφάνωσον αὐτόν [ἢ τὸν δούλον σου]."

939. "Κύριε...στεφάνωσον αὐτήν [ἢ τὴν δούλην σου]."

940. "παριστάμενοι."

crown them [or your servants]"[941] (*Codices Hagiot. Metochiou 68,*[942] *Athens 69,* and *S 966, M. Lavras 189, Paris 213, Patmos 104, Sinai 981*). Symeōn of Thessaloniki also knows the chanting of the verse, "O Lord our God, crown them with glory and honor," during the crowning: "Next also taking and blessing the crowns from the altar, he places the one on the head of the man, and the other on the head of the woman, praying to the Lord God of all things to crown them with glory and honor who are being joined chastely in Him" (*Dialogue,* chapter 279).[943]

In some manuscripts, we also encounter a combination of the above verse with a small priestly prayer inspired by the Psalms: "O Lord our God, crown your servant and set him over the works of your hands"[944] (*Vatopediou 322/934, Patmos 690, Sinai 968*) or even loosely: "The Father blesses, the Son crowns [or wreaths or places], the Holy Spirit supports and perfects [or sanctifies, overshadows them, or joins in approving and remains all the days of their lives]"[945] (*Athens 849, Cairo 104, Kouloumousiou 358, Kōnstamonitou 60/63, Panteleēmonos 364, Patmos 105, Sinai 966*). Finally, in late manuscripts, a sealing of the head begins to be emphasized ("he inscribes a sign of the cross on the head")[946] and forms similar to the present: "The servant of God [name] is crowned in the name of the Father... –The servant of God [name] is crowned in the name of the Father..."[947] (*Athens 851, Patmos 105*) or "The servant of God [name] is crowned with a crown of rejoicing in the name..." – "The servant of God [name] is crowned with a crown of rejoicing in the

941. "Κύριε... στεφάνωσον αὐτούς [ἢ τοὺς δούλους σου]."

942. See the footnote to question 197 regarding the possibility that the citation could be a misprint and actually be to either *Metochiou tou Panagiou Taphou Kōnstantinoupoleōs 68* or *T. Staurou 68.*

943. PG 155:509c.

944. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν στεφάνωσον τὸν δοῦλόν σου καὶ κατάστησον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου."

945. "Ὁ Πατὴρ εὐλογεῖ, ὁ Υἱὸς στεφανοῖ [ἢ στέφει ἢ θέτει], τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον παραγίνεται καὶ τελειοῖ [ἢ ἁγιάζει ἢ ἐπισκιάζει ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἢ συνευδοκεῖ καὶ διαμένει πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν]."

946. "χαράσσει σταυροῦ τύπον ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλήν."

947. "Στέφεται ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ Θεοῦ δεῖνα εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρός..., – Στέφεται ἡ δούλη τοῦ Θεοῦ δεῖνα εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρός..."

name..."[948] (*Athens 668, M. Lavras 88*). The closest one to the present-day form is found in a manuscript from the seventeenth century (*Athens 849*), which somewhat also freely combined the three traditions above: "The servant of God [name] is crowned for the servant of God [name] in the name of the Father. Amen. And of the Son. Amen. And of the Holy Spirit. Amen. Now and ever and unto the ages of ages. Amen."[949] Similarly, also for the bride: "The servant of God [name] is crowned for the servant of God [name]...."[950] And it continues: "The Father crowns, The Son blesses, The Holy Spirit overshadows them, always now and ever...O Lord our God, you crown them with glory and honor, and you set them over the works of your hands."[951] All these things are said once, just as also the variant forms in the preceding manuscripts. The "he is crowned" (στέφεται) in this manuscript has the meaning of "he espouses" (νυμφεύεται) and "she is subject to a man" (ὑπανδρεύεται).

The present-day form is found only in printed editions that also provide for its threefold repetition, which can be explained, as I have already said, by the emphasis that popular piety wished to give to this so impressive element of the benediction of marriage. The manuscript tradition shows that it justifies the reservations which the questioner indirectly expresses, when indeed comparing the verbose repetitions of the betrothal and of the marriage to the time-honored Doric simplicity of the onetime invocation of the Holy Trinity during baptism. The Metropolitan of Caesarea, Ambrosios Stavrinos, agrees (*The Benediction of Marriage*, Constantinople 1923, p. 156),[952]

---

948. "Στέφεται ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ Θεοῦ δεῖνα στέφανον ἀγαλλιάσεως εἰς τὸ ὄνομα..." – "Στέφεται ἡ δούλη τοῦ Θεοῦ δεῖνα στέφανον ἀγαλλιάσεως εἰς τὸ ὄνομα..."

949. "Στέφεται ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ Θεοῦ δεῖνα τὴν δούλην τοῦ Θεοῦ δεῖνα εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρός. Ἀμήν. Καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ. Ἀμήν. Καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Ἀμήν. Νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν."

950. "Στέφεται ἡ δούλη τοῦ Θεοῦ δεῖνα τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ Θεοῦ δεῖνα..."

951. "Ὁ Πατὴρ στέφει, ὁ Υἱὸς εὐλογεῖ, τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπισκιάζει αὐτούς, πάντοτε νῦν καὶ ἀεί... Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτοὺς καὶ κατέστησας αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου."

952. Ἀμβρόσιος Σταυρινός, *Ἡ Ἱερολογία τοῦ γάμου ἀπὸ τὰ τέλη τοῦ Θ΄ μέχρι τοῦ τέλους τοῦ ΙΣΤ΄ αἰῶνος* (Κωνσταντινούπολη: Ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1923), 156.

where in the "future form of the benediction of marriage" envisaged by him, after study of the manuscripts, he proposes that "instead of the triple enunciation over again of the words, 'The servant of God is crowned,' the enunciation of them takes place once, after which 'O Lord our God…' is chanted." However, I think that returning to the correct form is quite difficult.

## 466

**The opinion exists that during the week that precedes the fasting for August 15, "consumption of everything"[953] takes place. Some agree, others do not. Who is correct?**

Of the fasting periods of the ecclesiastical year (Great Lent, Holy Apostles, August 15, Nativity) only the first, Great Lent, is liturgically organized, in a manner indeed truly wonderful and wise. It alone has hymnography and a progression driven by and employed for the theme of fasting and during it alone the Divine Liturgy is not celebrated, precisely because of the fasting, penitential, and "mournful" character of these days. Entrance into it is structured in a gradual manner and in the following regime: consumption of everything, consumption of dairy,[954] and fasting.[955] And this is because it is the principal fast, the universal fast of the Church, the "fast of the Lord,"[956] as the Fathers call it. The other fasts began as private pious practices and, under the influence of monastic practice, entered ecclesiastical life, later and gradually, without ever reaching the depth or affecting the importance of Lent, which, in distinction from these, was named "Great,"[957] in the same way as it is and remained up until nowadays. For this reason, also, neither in the

953. "κατάλυσις εἰς πάντα," namely, non-fasting. The term, "κατάλυσις" is translated here based on its contextual and idiomatic meaning, rather than its literal lexical sense. Consequently, "κατάλυσις εἰς πάντα" is translated as "consumption of everything" (namely, non-fasting), "κατάλυσις τυροῦ" as "consumption of dairy," and "κατάλυσις ἰχθύος" as "consumption of fish." The term has this meaning in ecclesiastical books such as the Mēnaia.

954. "κατάλυση τυροῦ"

955. "νηστεία."

956. "νηστεία τοῦ Κυρίου."

957. "Μεγάλη."

hymnography for the days of these fasts do then we have a reference to the theme of fasting and, more importantly, the Divine Liturgy, the Paschal mystery of the Church, is celebrated. Namely, they are not days of mourning and compunction. It should be noted that these fasts (let us call them "small"[958] in contrast to the "great"[959]) were not and are not even the only pious fasts.[960] These generally became prevalent. Others remained and remain personal. As an example, I cite the *Georgian Calendar*—of Jerusalemite origins, translated from Greek, which is preserved in the *Codex Sinai 34* from the tenth century—where apart from Great Lent thirteen other forty-day or nearly forty-day fasts are also noted, which precede great feasts of saints and which those who so wished observed out of piety for these saints. And nowadays still, in a conservative province of Greece, the Metropolis of Mithymna,[961] three fasts in addition to the well-known ones are voluntarily kept by more pious and conservative faithful: the fasts of the Precious Cross (September 1–13), Saint Ignatios of Mithymna, an especially honored local saint, founder of the Monastery of Leimonos and the Monastery of the Myrsiniōtissa[962] (October 1–13), and the Taxiarchs[963] (November 1–7).

For all these fasts, public or personal, a preparatory period does not precede like that for the period of Great Lent. The "consumption of everything" during the week after Pentecost does not appear to be connected with the coming fast of the Holy Apostles, but with the celebration of Pentecost, the great feast of the Lord, the afterfeast of which is this week. The evidence of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (5.20.14) also confirms this, which was written around the end of the fourth century: "Therefore, after you celebrate Pentecost, cele-

958. "μικρές."
959. "μεγάλη."
960. Namely, fasts that are done out of piety.
961. The province of Mithymna was formerly part of the Lesbos prefecture and was abolished in 2006.
962. Ἡ Μονὴ τῆς Παναγίας Μυρσινιώτισσας.
963. "τῶν Ταξιαρχῶν." The Archangels Gabriēl and Michaēl.

brate one week and after that one you shall fast. For it is right both to rejoice over the gift from God and to fast after the relaxation."[964]

Popular piety calls the eve of the beginning for the fast of the Nativity, namely, the commemoration day of the holy Apostle Philip (November 14), "meatfare of Saint Philip,"[965] obviously meaning that "consumption of everything" occurs during it. For the people, this term is identical with consumption of meat as well. From what I know, this is not attested to by tradition. The Hōrologion provides for consumption of fish. Of the Typika of the Holy Mountain, the Typikon of the Monastery of Hagiou Pavlou prescribes "a consolation for the brethren"[966] (obviously with the anticipation of beginning the fast from the next day), the Typikon of the Monastery of Xēropotamou "consumption of fish,"[967] as well as the Typikon of the Monastery of Dionysiou, which characteristically notes: "There exists an old custom, which we follow, if the commemoration of Saint Philip falls on Wednesday or Friday...we consume only fish, without cheese." In the monasteries, "consumption of fish"[968] does not mean "consumption of everything,"[969] which is identical only with consumption of dairy and eggs, not meat. There does not exist such a provision for the fasting of August 15, not only for the week that precedes but neither for the eve (July 31).

## 467

**Is it permitted for the kontakion, "With the saints...,"[970] and the Beatitudes to be omitted during the funeral service, as I have heard done in some places? What is normal, for them to be omitted or to be chanted?**

The boundaries between "normal" and "abnormal" are a bit fluid in divine worship. For this reason, in many cases, it is difficult, if

964. *Apostolic Constitutions* 5.20.14 in *Les Constitutions Apostoliques,* ed. and trans. Marcel Metzger, SC 329 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1987), 283.
965. "ἀποκρηὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Φιλίππου."
966. "παράκλησιν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς."
967. "κατάλυσιν ἰχθύος."
968. "ἰχθύος κατάλυσις."
969. "κατάλυσις εἰς πάντα."
970. "Μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων..."

not impossible, to say with certainty and accountability what "is permitted" and what "is not permitted" to be omitted during the celebration of sacred services. The topic that is posed in the question above is perhaps one of the most characteristic and most classic examples to which "relativity" in some sense is applied, which is observed in the taxis of the services.

The complete and official form, theoretically in force, is that which we find printed in the Great Euchologion ("Service of the Funeral").[971] This is a service of a special funereal Matins, parallel to our well-known service of daily Matins, with all its individual elements: Psalm 90 ("He who lives by the help of the Most High...")[972] instead of the Six Psalms; the seventeenth kathisma of the Psalter (the amōmos, Psalm 118, "Blessed are the blameless in the way..."[973]) complete in three staseis; the stichēra of the amōmos, namely, the evlogētaria (here, naturally, the funereal); the kathisma "Give rest, O our Savior...";[974] Psalm 50; the funereal canon in the plagal of the fourth tone, "In the heavenly mansions ceaselessly...,"[975] with the mesōdio[976] kathisma after the third ode and the kontakion and oikos after the sixth ode ("Truly all is vanity..."[977] and "With the saints..."[978] – "You only are immortal..."[979]); eight stichēra idiomela (the funereal of the eight tones for lauds); the Beatitudes with eight troparia; prokeimenon; epistle; gospel; ektenēs; prayer; and twelve troparia for the aposticha of the kiss and doxastikon ("Brethren, come, let us give a last kiss..."[980] and so forth, and "Looking on me lying voiceless..."[981] with the Theotokion). Some differences, which are confirmed during the comparison of the present-day service of Matins and the funeral, are due either to the peculiarity of the

971. "Ἀκολουθία τοῦ ἐξοδιαστικοῦ."
972. "Ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν βοηθείᾳ τοῦ Ὑψίστου..."
973. "Μακάριοι οἱ ἄμωμοι ἐν ὁδῷ..."
974. "Ἀνάπαυσον, Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν..."
975. "Ἐν οὐρανίοις θαλάμοις διηνεκῶς..."
976. Intermediate.
977. "Ἀληθῶς ματαιότης τὰ σύμπαντα..."
978. "Μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων..."
979. "Αὐτὸς μόνος ὑπάρχεις ἀθάνατος..."
980. "Δεῦτε τελευταῖον ἀσπασμόν..."
981. "Ὁρῶντες με ἄφωνον..."

funeral or to other reasons that are explainable by a retrospection into the manuscript tradition but are not the topic at the moment. For example, in the funeral: Psalm 90 is chanted instead of the Six Psalms, an explicit mention of lauds and a doxology does not exist at least in printed editions, the Beatitudes' chanting, the epistle, and the gospel.[982] There absolutely does not exist any doubt that the funeral is a marvelous service with exceptional richness and wisely selected biblical and hymnological material. However, its marvelous richness was also the cause of its vicissitudes in liturgical practice.

And the time alone that its celebration required—about two hours—lead to an impasse and by necessity to abridgments and mutilations. We do not mean the particular conditions of the monasteries, but rather the circumstances of the parishes, if indeed it is taken under consideration that by necessity not only service-loving faithful participated in the funeral service. Since these abridgments took place more or less arbitrarily, namely, without the formal intervention and guidance of central ecclesiastical authority, it was to be expected that they produced inconsistences according to locale and catastrophic omissions or adjustments regarding the service itself. And the issue of inconsistency was not uncommon, especially before printed liturgical books became completely prevalent. However, rash and irresponsible interventions guided the editors of the Typika of the Great Church of Christ to give at the end of the Typikon an abridged outline for the celebration of the funeral service, as seems to have prevalently been chanted in Constantinople. Naturally, the new service is a shadow of the old. Omitted are Psalm 90, 158 verses of the amōmos (only eighteen are preserved, six from each stasis), the kathisma after the amōmos, Psalm 50, the canon, the mesōdio kathisma, the kontakion and the oikos, the Beatitudes, eleven troparia, and the doxastikon with the theotokion from the aposticha of the kiss. The slashings that took place are certainly reckless and

982. Namely, unlike the present-day Matins service, the funeral service does not include the Six Psalms, lauds, and a doxology. In addition, also dissimilar to the contemporary Matins, the funeral service includes Psalm 90, the chanting of the Beatitudes, an epistle reading, and a set gospel reading (not the eōthinon gospel).

distressing regarding the beautiful old funeral service. The funereal Matins can hardly be recognized in the present form of the service. However, it appears that these omissions were necessary. They gave a viable form and a natural length to the service and prevented it from worse corruptions than the arbitrary, but dubious, interventions caused to it.

Despite this radical intervention of the Typikon, certain regions remained more conservative. Thus, it is explained that "it is customary in the Church of Greece" for the kontakion "to be chanted," and "of course...customarily" the Beatitudes, as the Small Euchologion of the Apostolikē Diakonia of the Church of Greece notes. The "New Lands," from what I know, follow the patriarchal abridgment.[983] What now is the more accurate practice? Both, given that while the first is prescribed by the Typikon according to the taxis of the Great Church, the second is observed according to an obviously more ancient "custom." Let the criterion for selection be the prevailing local tradition. Wherever the kontakion and Beatitudes are chanted, it is not correct for them to be omitted and wherever they are not chanted, it would be unwise for their restoration to be attempted. The new service, despite all the omissions, remained quite rich.

## 468

**In the chanting of the canons during the service of Matins, a great inconsistency is observed. Some chant all the canons, others only the first and third odes, others the first, third and ninth odes, others read them, and others omit them. What is the proper thing in this instance?**

The answer to this question presupposes what we wrote in connection with the previous question, which was related to another topic, but which essentially is parallel to the question above. And here the

983. The "New Lands" are areas of Greece jurisdictionally under the Ecumenical Patriarchate but administered by the Church of Greece. For a discussion of the New Lands, see Metropolitan Demetrios of Sebasteia, *The Patriarchal and Synodal act of 1928: Crisis in the "New Lands"* (Northridge, CA: Narthex Press, 2007).

boundaries between normal and abnormal are so confused that it is not possible for anyone to answer such questions absolutely and authoritatively.

Specifically, to our topic, while the standard taxis is theoretically the same in the monasteries and in the parishes, in practice it would be unrealistic if, by stating what is theoretically implemented in the practice of the monasteries, one had the illusion that this solved the problem of the taxis for parishes. And this is not only for historical reasons, namely, that by looking back at the ancient tradition of the Church one confirmed the existence of dual Typika, of the monastic for the monasteries and of the secular Typikon, which is especially adapted to the needs of the parishes. Nor again that by being reconciled to the present-day—let us thus characterize it— "anarchy" in the practice of the parishes, one disregarded the correct and indisputably precise deontology, which is defined by the practice of the sacred monasteries. But let us say it in advance and this will be proven from the following. This disorder, particularly in the parishes, is not due to malice or neglect of those responsible for conducting the service, nor even to ignorance of the correct taxis nor much more to impiety. It has deeper and substantial causes, which whether we freely admit them or conceal them, have critical consequences for the celebration of the sacred services and influence, certainly to a lesser extent, also this monastic practice.

By necessity, we must do a retrospection into the tradition of the canons, by reviewing largely well-known matters. The canons are systems of troparia, which are intended to adorn the chanting of the nine biblical odes and to adjust their themes to the feast or to the commemoration of the saint that the Church is celebrating. Namely, they function just as the stichēra also precisely do in the psalms of Lamp-lighting and of the lauds in Matins. Just as the stichēra, thus also the canons are clearly a monastic hymnological form, as is clear also from the intensity of their ideas and the manner of their chanting. Namely, the troparia of the odes of the canons are chanted as stichēra of the respective biblical odes in ten, eight, six, or four verses, just as precisely the stichēra of "Lord, I have cried to you..." and the psalms of lauds. Just as there, the psalms are chanted

with all their verses ("Lord, I have cried to you[984]...Let my prayer be set forth[985]...Set a watch, O Lord[986]..." and so forth—"Let everything that has breath[987]...Praise him all[988]...Praise him sun and moon[989]..." and so forth) and the stichēra are inserted into their last verses, according to the respective specifications of the Typikon. In this manner precisely, the nine (eight) odes are also chanted in the tone of the first canon and the troparia of the corresponding odes of the canons are inserted into their last verses, again according to the taxis that is prescribed by the Typikon. The biblical odes are found, as is well known, at the end of the Psalter and in the Hōrologion in the service of Matins.

According to the more precise taxis, the troparia are chanted "in ten" verses. Namely, the heirmos is chanted twice at the start of the ode and before the beginning of the stichologia; ten troparia at the ten last verses of the ode; two at the "Glory" and at the "Now and ever"; and, finally, the katabasia.[990] A total of fifteen troparia together with the heirmos and the katabasia are inserted in the stichologia of each ode, whether there are three canons or one, in which case its troparia are repeated until they reach the required number. One can hear this correct and precise manner of the stichologia of the odes and the chanting of the canons in the series of recordings that have been published in 1985 by the Holy Women's Cenobium of the Annunciation of the Theotokos, Ormylia Chalkidiki, in cooperation with Professor Gr. Stathēs, and that capture the service of the celebration of Saint Mary Magdalēnē. The chanting of the first and third odes according to this system, without a kanonarchēma,[991] lasts nearly twenty minutes. If the nine (eight) odes were also chanted, the chanting of the odes and the canons would well exceed an hour.

984. "Κύριε ἐκέκραξα πρὸς σέ..."
985. "Κατευθυνθήτω..."
986. "Θοῦ Κύριε..."
987. "Πᾶσα πνοή..."
988. "Αἰνεῖτε αὐτὸν πάντες..."
989. "Αἰνεῖτε αὐτὸν ἥλιος καὶ σελήνη..."
990. Heirmos (2 times)+10 troparia+1 troparion at the "Glory"+1 troparion at the "Now and ever" +1 katabasia=15 troparia.
991. The step-by-step recitation of the hymns by a precentor known as a canonarch (κανονάρχης).

That is about as long as it also lasts on Mount Athos in monasteries that observe the precise ancient taxis.

However, already even in these monasteries of the Holy Mountain, the omission of all the remaining verses of the odes, in which troparia are not inserted (they total fifty), has been legitimized. The Hagioritic publication of the stichologia by the Community of Papa–Savvas,[992] which is regularly used on the Holy Mountain, contains only ten verses from each ode, the first and last ones. Moreover, in quite a few Hagioritic monasteries, varied arrangements take place in practice. Either the traditional kanonarchēma is not done or the first, third, and ninth odes alone are recited with the verses of the biblical odes and the others are read, or the odes are read separately and the canons separately (as just about takes place in the parishes with the triōdia during Great Lent), or the canons of all the odes from the Paraklētikē are first read and afterwards of the Mēnaion. However, in principle, neither the biblical odes nor the canons provided each time by the Typikon are omitted.

I think that it is not necessary for us to explain why in certain monasteries—even of Mount Athos so conservative and precise in practice—this undoubtedly imprecise taxis became prevalent. When something becomes excessively long, as we also saw in the funeral service, even if it is splendid and marvelous, it becomes unwieldly and problematic. The solutions that are necessarily given are, as a rule, destructive for correct liturgical practice (as again we saw in the funeral service), but create a more viable, even though defective, form. These things are concerned with the practice of the monasteries.

What takes place now in parishes after the transfer to them of the deontology of the monastic Typikon? One can imagine this, even if one does not know, since the entire service of Matins lasts almost as long as the stichologia of the odes and canons in the monasteries. The first thing that bore the weight of adjustment was the original and primary element, the biblical odes, which suffered almost a

992. "τῆς συνοδείας τοῦ παπα–Σάββα." "Ἡ συνοδεία" (community, fellowship, those journeying in company, assembly) here is a small monastic brotherhood following the guidance of an elder (a priest, indicated by the word "Papa," named Savvas).

complete excision. We say almost, because eight- and one-half odes are omitted, and only half the ninth is chanted, namely, the ode for the Theotokos ("My soul magnifies…").[993] This has its parallels in the omission of the verses of the psalms of Lamp-lighting and lauds. At least, there, both the first and last verses were preserved, depending on the number of troparia. At least this is something. From the stichologia of the odes, not one trace remains. The "Glory to you, O God…,"[994] "O most holy Theotokos…,"[995] "O holy one of God…"[996] and the like, which are chanted prior to the troparia of the canons, are not verses. We will see this in an answer to another question which is related to this subject.[997] It is not possible for anyone to approve what happened. The sacred hymnographers, who composed the canons, never considered that it would be possible for their hymns to be chanted independent of the odes, much less replace them. Because this is what happened in actuality. The biblical element was and, in theory, is the backbone of the service. The troparion is the requisite adornment. When the essential biblical element of the odes was omitted and the canons remained, the necessary balance and harmony of the scriptural and hymnological elements were missing, and the skeleton itself was destroyed, upon which the service was built. The canons of Matins independent from the biblical odes remained, just as in the Paraklēsis, Akathist, Midnight Office, and so forth.

In theory, the current Typikon is based right there, namely, upon the chanting of all the canons. However, it was to be expected in practice, after the breakdown of the cohesive framework of the biblical odes, that corruptions follow, which we experience on a daily basis. Depending on the time available and the degree of the priests' and chanters' conservativism, the canons are chanted or read, in part or in whole or are even completely omitted. Effectively, the canon of Pascha, the triōdia, and the canons of Great Week alone remained to

993. "Μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχή μου…"
994. "Δόξα σοι, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν…"
995. "Ὑπεραγία Θεοτόκε…"
996. "Ἅγιε τοῦ Θεοῦ…"
997. See question 491.

be chanted. On the other feasts of the Lord and the Mother of God, the katabasies and the ninth ode alone are usually chanted. For the other odes, the intermediate solution of reading was found, which salvages in some manner the form and even offers the meaning of the troparia. However, meaning and music are interrelated. With the reading, it is not an exaggeration for us to say that the service is essentially damaged. The canons of the great feasts especially, works of great hymnographers and Fathers, are truly marvelous poetical and theological texts, vested with equally marvelous music. Their omission or even their reading deprives God's people of a significant sacred aesthetical delight, and naturally, of the teaching associated with it.

However, while deliberately disregarding the widely known reality of parish temples and insisting in practice on not chanting all of the canons provided for by the monastic taxis in the worldly churches, I do not know whether and to what extent the Typikon inhibits or conversely abets the arbitrary and destructive individual initiatives regarding the service. Perhaps, the example of the funeral service, which we saw in the prior answer, would be instructive. While that audacious initiative[998] damaged, as we saw, that great splendid service, yet it saved it from abuses and worse corruption, giving it a viable form.

In the case in question, the Typikon prescribes usually three canons with eight odes to be chanted, namely, to be precise, nearly 120 troparia, as we saw in the taxis of the monasteries. If it prescribed one or two odes to be chanted every time, by rotation or fixed (as done for the triōdia), with stichologia, this would also be much closer to the ancient and correct practice and to contemporary reality. Thus, there would be hope for the practice of the parishes (which in the question is correctly ascertained to suffer from great, but as we established, inevitable disorder) to embark on a more correct path and a more disciplined taxis. Otherwise, without having to be a prophet, anyone can see where the present-day parish practice is

998. The Typikon of the Great Church.

leading; to the restriction of the chanting of the odes and the canons of Matins only to the katabasies.[999]

## 469

**Why during the feasts of the Transfiguration and the Ascension are the heirmoi of the canons of these feasts not chanted as katabasies, but those of the Cross and of Pentecost? Perhaps, this is a mistake of the Typikon?**

In order for us to understand the operating system of the katabasies—clearly an element of monastic origin—we must look at the more ancient corresponding parish "asmatic" practice, which is especially enlightening. During the chanting of the "asmatic" antiphons (of a psalm or ode with ephymnion or a small troparion repeated at each verse) after the "Glory both now" the troparion was repeated more intensely, perhaps also by both choirs together, as a conclusion of the entire antiphon. This was the so-called "perissē."[1000] This practice survives nowadays during the chanting of "Let my prayer be set forth" with verses from Psalm 140 in the Presanctified; during "Christ is risen"[1001] with the verses of Psalm 67 during Pascha; "You were born secretly…"[1002] and "You dawned forth from a virgin…"[1003] with the corresponding eighty-sixth and ninety-second Psalms during the Vespers of the Nativity, and the comparable troparia of the eve of the feast of Lights; and partially in the trisagion of the Divine Liturgy, in which "Dynamis" is nothing other than the ancient "perissē." There are also exceptions to this rule, when the troparion/ephymnion of the psalm is not chanted as a perissē, but another troparion. We

---

999. This is already the practice in most Greek Orthodox parishes in North America.

1000. Perrisē (περισσή), the double final repetition of the entire troparion; sometimes the term refers to a second refrain substituted at the end of the antiphon for the final repetition of the troparion, see Robert F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Vol. II, The Great Entrance: A History of the Transfer of Gifts and Other Preanaphoral Rites*, OCA 200, 4th ed. (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2004), 88.

1001. "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη…"

1002. "Λαθὼν ἐτέχθης…"

1003. "Ἀνέτειλας Χριστὲ ἐκ Παρθένου…"

encounter characteristic survivals of this practice in the second and third antiphons of the Divine Liturgy, where the hymn, "Only begotten Son...,"[1004] occupies the position of the perissē in the second antiphon, and, in the third, the kontakion that is chanted after the entrance.

In the monastic practice nowadays, the katabasia is what the perissē of the "asmatic" Typikon also was and functions precisely as it did in the stichologia of the nine (eight) odes and of their troparia (and of the canons) during the service of Matins. It is not the time to examine whether the term "katabasia" (καταβασία) concerns the manner of chanting, according to the commonly held explanation—namely, that the choirs came down (κατέβαιναν) to the middle of the temple and chanted it more intensely together, just as the perissē or the "Dynamis" of the trisagion—or if it is a term identical to the term "heirmos," as Saint Markos Eugenikos intends it ("on account of the remaining [troparia] conforming [καταβιβάζεσθαι] to it," *Explanation of the Church's Daily Office*)[1005] and as it appears to be understood by certain ancient standard rubrics ("and again the katabasies [namely, the heirmoi] are said"). Let us only note that in the manuscripts the troparia of the Hours are called for the same reasons, "katabasies" (καταβασίες). We ourselves are only concerned that the two choirs naturally chanted the katabasies more intensely and more festively, as a conclusion of the stichologia of every single ode. The most natural thing, indeed according to the model of the perissē, was for the heirmos of the canon to be chanted,[1006] which was chanted and particularly that of the last canon, if there were more canons than one. In the ancient Typika, when there is no discussion regarding katabasies, this does not mean that katabasies did not exist, but that it was self-evident that at the end of every ode, its heirmos was repeated. This is in use even nowadays, at least in most cases.

---

1004. "Ὁ μονογενὴς Υἱός..."

1005. Saint Markos Eugenikos, *Ἐξήγησις ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας* (*Explanation of the Church's Daily Office*), PG 160:1189d.

1006. Namely, the main or primary canon. In other words, there are two heirmoi chanted in the case of more than one canon.

However, there are exceptions, just as we saw also takes place in the case of the perissē. The most characteristic are those that are referenced in the question, the katabasies of the Transfiguration and of the Ascension, as well as the katabasies of the Entrance. The older practice also knew other similar exceptions, but which do not always coincide with those in use nowadays. For example, in the Typikon of the temple of the Resurrection of Jerusalem, which is preserved in the *Codex Timiou Staurou 43* from the year 1122, in the triōdion of Great Monday, in the diōdion of Great Tuesday, and in the triōdion of Great Wednesday of Saint Kosmas,[1007] the heirmoi of the following day, namely, respectively of Great Tuesday, Great Wednesday and Great Thursday, were chanted as katabasies (there, they are called "theseis," θέσεις).[1008] According to the Typikon of the Monastery of the Evergetis of Constantinople of the codex of *National Library of Athens 788* from the twelfth century, an exception is applied regarding the feast of the Circumcision of the Lord (January first), according to which, as also nowadays, the chanting of the heirmoi of the canons of Theophany are provided for ("lastly, we the choirs say in unison the katabasies of the feast of Lights, 'The Lord mighty in wars…,'[1009] and 'Israel treads…'[1010]").[1011] However, for the feast of the Transfiguration, opposite to what is in use nowadays, the heirmoi of the second canon ("finally, both choirs [chant] the heirmoi of the same canon, 'Travelling through the sea…'[1012]") were provided as katabasies; for the Entrance, the heirmoi again of the second canon, which nowadays is chanted as first ("finally, the choirs together the heirmoi, 'I shall open my mouth…'"[1013]); and finally, for the feast of the Ascension, the heirmoi of the canon of the feast ("last, the choir the heirmoi once, plagal of the first tone, 'God the

1007. Saint Kosmas the Hymnographer (ca. 675–ca. 752).

1008. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, 2:36, 56, 72.

1009. "Βυθοῦ ἀνεκάλυψε…"

1010. "Στίβη θαλάσσης…"

1011. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, September to February*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.5 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2000), 384–385.

1012. "'Υγρὰν διοδεύσας…"

1013. "Ἀνοίξω τό στόμα…"

Savior…'"[1014]).[1015] In the Typikon of the Monastery of the Savior in Messina, of the *Codex Messina 115* from the year 1131, we find nearly the same rubrics for the feasts of the Circumcision and the Transfiguration.[1016] The absence of a special provision for the feasts of the Entrance and Ascension means that on these days the heirmoi of the canons for these feasts were chanted as katabasies according to what was generally practiced, namely, as also in the Monastery of the Evergetis.

The Typikon of the Great Church of Thessaloniki from the fifteenth century of the *Codex Athens 2047*, which combines, in accordance with the reform of Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, "asmatic" and monastic Typika, provides the katabasies "Christ is born"[1017] for the feast of the Entrance and the double katabasies of the feast of Lights for the feast of the Circumcision. The rubrics for the feast of the Transfiguration and of the Ascension are not preserved. The later Hagioritic manuscript Typika (Dionysiou, Grēgoriou, Hagiou Pavlou, Xēropotamou), as well as the printed Typika of the Great Church (Kōnstantinos[1018] and Violakēs[1019]) present the well-known practice in use: the katabasies of the Cross are provided for the feast of the Transfiguration, the katabasies of Pentecost for the Ascen-

1014. "Τῷ Σωτῆρι Θεῷ…"

1015. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 232–233; Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, September to February, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations*, 6.5 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2000), 220–221; Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 620–621.

1016. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 91, 176.

1017. "Χριστὸς γεννᾶται…"

1018. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 196, 252, and 41.

1019. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 301, 385, and 100.

sion, and the "pezes" (πεζές)[1020] of the Nativity for the Entrance. The Typikon of Saint Sabas, which is the maternal form for all modern monastic Typika and their parish abridgments, provides for precisely this on these feasts.[1021] Is this a mistake? Probably not. If we also take into consideration the evidence of the Typikon of the Resurrection for the first days of Great Week, it appears that, at least in Jerusalem, the katabasies played a connecting role between the various feasts. Thus, the katabasies of Pentecost connect the feasts of the Ascension and Pentecost, the katabasies of the Cross the feasts of the Transfiguration and Exaltation, and the katabasies of the Nativity the feasts of the Entrance and the Nativity. Moreover, the historical and theological connection is well-known of these three pairs of feasts, which is apparent also from the standard definition of the days for the celebration of the latter two in the Heortologion, forty days or nearly forty days from the Exaltation and Nativity respectively. On feasts nowadays, the katabasies are chanted nearly alone. Thus, it is strongly apparent that we leave the feast being conducted and are engaged with the preparation for another anticipated feast, given that it is considered related and near in time to the present one. This surprises us, and perhaps not unfairly. If the Typikon was drawn up consistent with present-day parish conditions, the pertinent rubrics would not have had the form that they have now. Without doubt, the heirmoi of the canons of the feasts being celebrated, and not that of the anticipated feasts, would be chanted.

However, in monastic practice, the katabasies of the feasts above distinctively play the connecting role that liturgical tradition gave them. Namely, after every single ode of the canon for the feast is chanted and its contents thoroughly set forth and sung, the katabasia then comes to place the feast being celebrated into the entire festal calendar framework and to open up a perspective towards

1020. This word refers to the non-Iambic katabasies. The pezes katabasies are those written in more common or plain style (prose), while the iambic katabasies follow a meter having roots in classical poetry and use elevated speech.

1021. Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012), 255, 370, 123.

the other great feast that is approaching. However, the fact that the practice of the monasteries did not remain monolithically consistent even after the prevalence of this rubric of the Typikon of Saint Sabas is also apparent from the rubrics of the old Typikon of the Monastery of Dionysiou of the Holy Mountain where on the leavetaking of the feast of the Transfiguration and the Sunday that fell in the afterfeast days, it provided for the chanting not of the katabasies of the Cross, but the heirmoi of the feast ("The choirs of Israel..."[1022] and so forth).

## 470

**The first choir always chants the katabasia of the third ode in monasteries, the left choir in parishes. Which is more correct?**

## 471

**Why does the right choir intervene and chant the end[1023] of the katabasia of the third ode and why when we have double katabasies do these interventions take place more often, so much that confusions and mistakes are created? Would it not be preferable and simpler for the one choir to chant the "pezes" (πεζές) and the other the "iambic" katabasies?[1024]**

The practice of the monasteries is certainly the most correct. The first choir, which in the monasteries is not always the right as in the parishes, chants the katabasies of the odes that are numbered with a (prime) odd number, namely, 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9. The second choir chants the katabasies of the odes that are numbered with a

1022. "Χοροὶ Ἰσραήλ..."

1023. The term 'end' refers to the last few concluding words of a troparion, which are chanted by the other choir, to preserve an antiphonal exchange prior to the commencement of the next troparion by the 'correct' choir. This also occurs in practice when the clergy elect to chant the kontakion after the small entrance, and the concluding words of the kontakion are taken over by the choir, so that the clergy and choir can 'preserve' an antiphonal exchange with the exclamation that follows the kontakion.

1024. The pezes katabasies are those written in more common or plain style (prose), while the iambic katabasies follow a meter having roots in classical poetry and use elevated speech.

(composite) even number, namely, 2, 4, 6, and 8. The same choirs also begin the chanting of the respective odes of the canons, when chanting their heirmoi. In theory, the same taxis applies to both monasteries and parishes. However, in practice, the taxis for parishes became different, when during modern times it became prevalent for all the katabasies to be chanted together after the synaxarion and the canons to be chanted or read all together before the synaxarion or even omitted in part or in whole.

In any case, the anomaly must be very old and is due to the omission of the second ode from the canons, the heirmos of which, namely, the beginning of the ode's chanting as well as the katabasia at the end, if it existed, was chanted by the second choir. Thus, in the monasteries, the second choir chants the theotokion of the first ode or the end of its katabasia, if it exists, thus giving the possibility to the first choir to begin the third ode that belongs to it, given that a second ode does not exist in the canon. For the same reason when the katabasies are double (Nativity, Theophany, Pentecost), the first choir takes the end of the iambic katabasia of the fifth and seventh odes and the second choir the end of the fourth in order that also again the respective possibility is given to the second choir to begin the heirmos of the sixth and eighth odes, but to the first choir the heirmos of the fifth. This takes place at the end of the katabasies of the third and sixth odes, because, as is well known, the synaptes follow, just as also at the end of the eighth ode, because the diaconal command, "The Theotokos and mother of the light...,"[1025] is inserted, but concerning which we will discuss in another answer.

In the parishes, the same thing took place somewhat differently. And here the right choir chants the katabasia of the first ode, as well as all the odd ones (περιττές), while the left choir chants all the even ones. However, the second choir came to improperly chant the katabasia of the third ode, perhaps in order that two katabasies from the outset are not chanted together by the same choir. Thus, the correct order was restored later, when the right choir took the end of the katabasia of the third ode in order to give the left choir the

1025. "Τὴν Θεοτόκον καὶ μητέρα τοῦ φωτός..."

possibility to begin the katabasia of the fourth ode, which belongs to it. Something analogous also occurs with the double katabasies. However, the correct order is restored immediately, because the left choir chants the iambic katabasia of the first ode and the right easily the "pezĕ" (πεζή) of the third ode. However, the interventions of the choirs at the end of the iambic katabasies are multiplied in the parishes, because the katabasies are chanted, as we said, collectively, without the intermediate synaptes being inserted, with the exception only of the exhortation, "The Theotokos...," at the beginning of the ninth ode. For this reason, the right choir took the end of the third, fifth, and seventh iambic katabasies in order that the left chant the fourth, sixth, and eighth "pezē" (πεζή) katabasies.

All these things perhaps appear a bit complex and scholastic, but in essence they are not. On the contrary, they attest to an elevated sense of taxis and liturgical decorum. It suffices that one understands the theoretical principles on the basis of which the alternation of the choirs in chanting is regulated and the reasons that caused the apparent confusion, namely, when the choir that has the primacy (the right in the parishes) chants the katabasies with an odd number of the odes and the second choir (the left in the parishes) chants the katabasies with the even number. The anomaly, we repeat, is due to the omission of the second ode and, in the parishes, to the collective chanting of the katabasies and to the custom that the left choir chants the katabasia of the third ode.

It appears that the practice of the monasteries is the more precise in the chanting of the canon of the Akathist, that of Pascha, and the triōdia and canons of Great Week. In these cases, where the correct old taxis is also maintained in parishes, the right choir chants the heirmos at the beginning of the third ode and repeats it at the end as a katabasia.

## 472

**Why before the exclamation, "For you, our God, are holy... ,"[1026] of the Divine Liturgy does the deacon (or the priest) say, "Let us pray to the Lord,"1027 when a prayer does not follow?**

## 473

**When a deacon concelebrates, why does he say the end of the exclamation for the prayer of the trisagion ("And to the ages of ages"),[1028] while in all the other exclamations, the priest says the entire exclamation alone?**

The questions above note two peculiarities of our liturgical practice, which do not surprise us because we have gotten used to them but raise legitimate questions for those who more carefully study the text of our Liturgy.

With the diaconal command, "Let us pray to the Lord," priestly prayers or diaconal synaptes are very logically introduced. Both the prayers and the synaptes refer the entreaties of the prayer of the church community to God and place in the mouths of the people of God the considerations of the prayer. Here, instead of a prayer or synaptē, an exclamation is introduced that glorifies God as holy, without there existing entreaties, supplications for us to pray. Certainly, this placing first of the phrase, "Let us pray to the Lord," could be considered to have originated from a kind of sacred custom, just as we see takes place during a later period in putting on sacred vestments and in the proskomidē. There, psalmic verses ("My soul shall rejoice...,"[1029] and "Shelter us..."[1030]), without an immediate correlation to what was said, are customarily introduced with this already standardized diaconal phrase. However, here, as we shall see in the following, it is not about this.

---

1026. "Ὅτι ἅγιος εἶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν..."

1027. "Τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."

1028. "Καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων."

1029. "Ἀγαλλιάσσεται ἡ ψυχή μου..." (Isa 61:10). "Ἀγαλλιάσσεται" appears in the text. However, the generally accepted reading is "Ἀγαλλιάσθω."

1030. "Σκέπασον ἡμᾶς..." (Ps 16:8).

Still, in all these cases, the doxological conclusion of the prayers, the "exclamation," is said by the priest together with its stereotypical ending ("now and always and to the ages of ages")[1031] complete, without the deacon intervening in order to take the end ("and to the ages of ages"),[1032] as takes place in the exclamation of the prayer of the trisagion. We find something similar, but more complete ("Always now and ever and to the ages of ages")[1033] being said during the deposit of the remains of the Precious Gifts in the prothesis (or earlier in the diakonikon), but only by the priest, or like a refrain, again unconnected, during the putting on of any vestment. However, these later instances are also not related to the present one.

Both these particular elements are remnants that successive phases of development left behind for this element of the Divine Liturgy. From the historical evidence, we know that the trisagion was used as a processional troparion already by the fifth century. This use of the trisagion survived up until nowadays in the funeral service and in the "asmatic" trisagia associated with a procession at the end of the doxology during Great Saturday and the feasts of the Precious Cross. From the sixth century, we find it at the beginning of the Divine Liturgy as an eisodikon, namely, again as a troparion for a procession, whether it was celebrated after a procession or not. At the time, its chanting accompanied the stichologia of a psalm, likely the seventy-ninth, and the Divine Liturgy began immediately from it, without a synaptē, exclamation, and trisagion prayer. The three antiphons had not yet been introduced. The trisagion maintains this character of an eisodikon even nowadays in the hierarchical Liturgy. During the trisagion, the hierarch occupies the throne. During the sixth–seventh centuries, the third antiphon is introduced before the trisagion as an eisodikon. The trisagion remains in its place, but the great synaptē (the litany of peace), the prayer of the trisagion, and its exclamation are preceding it. This phase is also preserved in the ancient Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos and in the

1031. "νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων."
1032. "καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων."
1033. "Πάντοτε νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων."

service of the great schēma. Moreover, the archaic Liturgies of Saint Basileios joined with Vespers on the eves of the Nativity and Theophany, Great Thursday, and Great Saturday, also begin nowadays from the trisagion. The preceding matters relate to Vespers. From the seventh up until the tenth centuries, two other antiphons are added to the entrance (third) antiphon and the proskomidē is done during them. However, the great synaptē remains in its old place, namely, before the trisagion. From the eleventh up until the thirteenth centuries, other changes gradually also take place: the proskomidē is transferred before the enarxis of the Divine Liturgy and gains independence. The great synaptē is transferred before the first antiphon and the prayer of the trisagion (which was said inaudibly during it or within earshot[1034] of the people during the synaptē between the prayer and exclamation) starts to be said in reverse order during the chanting of the trisagion. Its starting phrase ("Let us pray to the Lord") remained a remnant of the synaptē, which introduced either the prayer of the trisagion, if the prayer continued to be said before the trisagion, or even only the exclamation, if the prayer was transferred, a thing that also eventually became prevalent. Thus, we arrive at the answer to the first question.

During one of the successive phases, which the liturgical taxis passed through up until it obtained the present form and which we roughly outlined above, there were two parallel great synaptes: the original before the trisagion and the newer one before the first antiphon. Namely, in this intermediate phase, the litanies were said twice, just as for analogous historical reasons in the present form of the Divine Liturgy, the plērōtika and the petitions are provided for twice, after the great entrance and before the "Our Father." When the second litany of peace (the synaptē of the trisagion) was omitted, the deacon as master of ceremonies gave a sign to the choir to begin the trisagion immediately after the troparia. He gave the sign either simply by displaying his orarion to the people or, by a misinterpretation, crossing them with it, or by combining the displaying of the orarion with the exclamation, "And to the ages of ages." This inter-

1034. "εἰς ἐπήκοον."

polation of the deacon was particularly necessary in those instances where the synaptē was completely omitted (even its beginning, "Let us pray to the Lord") and where not only the prayer of the trisagion, but even its exclamation, were inaudibly said during the chanting of the trisagion.

Finally, the present-day, rather compromising, form became prevalent: The deacon says only the beginning of the synaptē ("Let us pray to the Lord") and the conclusion of the exclamation ("and to the ages of ages"), turning to the people and displaying the orarion to them. In this way, he notifies them—even though the reason was forgotten in the meantime—concerning the omission of the ektenēs and gives them the sign for the beginning of the trisagion ("the time of the trisagion").[1035]

The professor of blessed memory Panagiōtes Trempelas in his monumental book, *The Three Liturgies According to the Codices in Athens*, Athens 1935, pp. 40–45,[1036] thoroughly analyzes the course of development for the introduction of the trisagion into the Divine Liturgy, and the phases that followed, and cites the pertinent evidence from sources and manuscripts. He concludes in the reasonable hypothesis that the present-day form probably came from the impact of the Roman Liturgy in regions influenced by it (Southern Italy, Illyricum), was introduced to Constantinople during the period of the Crusades, and finally became prevalent by the seventeenth century.

The introduction in a similar manner of the same or a similar exclamation into the Hagiasmos, holy baptism, and the festal Matins ("Let us pray to the Lord—For you, our God, are holy...") is due to the obvious influence of the Divine Liturgy.

1035. "τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ τρισαγίου." Namely, a beginning of the trisagion.
1036. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 40–45.

## 474

**In the canon of the Mēnaion for March 6th, we observe that the first troparion for each ode (after the heirmos) is referring to Christ. This is not customary. How did this happen and how was this troparion inserted into the canon for the saint?**

This concerns the canon in the fourth tone for Blessed Gerasimos in Jordan, which in the theotokia forms acrostically the name of the hymnographer, "Geōrgiou" (Γεωργίου). Indeed, the first troparion after the heirmos of each ode does not refer to the Blessed one, but to Christ and particularly to fasting and abstinence. But, if we pay attention, we will also confirm that the theotokia of the odes, except the sixth and ninth, return to the same theme with nearly the same words and phrases. The canon in the plagal of the fourth tone for Saint Sabinos of Egypt from March 16 also precisely follows the same line. And here the first troparia of the odes and the theotokia, apart from the theotokia of the fourth, sixth, and ninth odes, have the theme of fasting and abstinence. The canons are obviously the works of the same author both because they are similar technically and lexically, and because the theotokia of the second canon also form the acrostic "Geōrgiou" (Γεωργίου). It is difficult to determine presently which among identically named hymnographers is the composer of these canons, and at least here this does not interest us.

Certainly, there are exceptions. As a rule, all troparia of canons refer to the same theme, namely, the feast or the saint of the day. But the exceptions that we encounter are not the only ones. We gather together a few: In the canon in the third tone of the Sunday of the Paralytic from the Pentēkostarion, a work of Iōsēph of Thessaloniki, the last troparion of all the odes refers to the Archangel Michaël. In the anonymous canon of Saint Mōkios on May 11, the first troparion of each ode is dedicated to the Founding of Constantinople, which was celebrated on the same day. Likewise, in the anonymous first canon of Saint Euphrosynē from September 25, the first troparion of each ode has the great earthquake as a theme and the "seizing of the

child in the air."[1037] However, since all the canons above do not form an acrostic, it is difficult to identify whether these troparia belonged to the original canon or if they have been added after the fact.

Conversely, we have other canons where their acrostic indicates that they have been originally composed with a double theme. Examples offhand include the canons of Iōsēph the hymnographer from the Paraklētikē, in all tones and on all days (except Thursday) where for each ode there are two katanyktika and two martyrika (Monday and Tuesday), two staurōsima and two martyrika (Wednesday and Friday), two or three "for all saints," and two martyrika and one funereal[1038] (Saturday). Moreover, in the Mēnaia, we encounter a few canons that attempt to combine the encomium for the saint of the day with the nearest feast of the Lord, on the forefeast or afterfeast days of which the commemorations of these saints fall. For this purpose, these also use the first troparia of the odes or the theotokia or even both. For example, on December 22, the two canons of Saint Anastasia, a work of Iōsēph, both also with acrostics, have the first troparia of the odes and the theotokia dedicated to the approaching Nativity. Two canons anonymous and without an acrostic, of Blessed Theoktistos (January 4) and Blessed Synglētikē (January 5), combine the forefeast of Theophany—the former in the first two troparia of the first and third ode, but the latter in the theotokia of nearly all the odes (except the first and fourth).

A characteristic example of a compound canon, which indeed connects the examples above with the canon to which the question refers and assists us in answering, is the canon for the Holy Infants of

1037. "ἐν ἀέρι ἁρπαγὴν τοῦ παιδός." For a discussion of earthquakes and their effects on the Typikon, see Brian Croke, "Two Early Byzantine Earthquakes and their Liturgical Commemoration," *Byzantion* 51 (1981): 122–147; Mark Roosien, "The Liturgical Commemoration of Earthquakes in Late Antique Constantinople: At the Intersection of Ritual, Environment, and Empire" (PhD diss., The University of Notre Dame, 2018); Antti Arjava, "The Mystery Cloud of 536 CE in the Mediterranean Sources," *DOP* 59 (2005): 73–94; Glanville Downey, "Earthquakes at Constantinople and Vicinity, A.D. 342–1454," *Speculum* 30 (1955): 596–600; and Emanuela Guidoboni, *Catalogue of ancient earthquakes in the Mediterranean area up to the 10th century* (Bologna: Istituto Nationale di Geofisica, 1994).

1038. "νεκρώσιμο."

Bethlehem (December 29). As is clear from the acrostic of the theotokia, this is a work of the hymnographer Geōrgios and combines three themes: the afterfeast of the Nativity (first troparion and theotokion of each ode), the encomium for the Holy Infants (second and third troparion of each ode—only the second in the fifth and sixth), and the commemoration of Blessed Markellos the Sleepless One (the last troparion of each ode). The canon has an acrostic, "Νεογνὰ Χριστοῦ θύματα στέφω λόγοις" (New-born sacrifices for Christ I crown in words), into which all the above troparia are integrated. It is almost certain that the hymnographer Geōrgios of this canon is the same person as Geōrgios, the author of both the canons for Blessed Gerasimos, to which the question is referring, and for the martyr Sabinos. As here the composer combined the feast of the Nativity with the commemoration of the Holy Infants by using the first troparia of the odes and the theotokia, thus also there he combined the themes of the period of Lent (fasting, abstinence, war against the passions, purification, and anticipation of the Christ's Passions and Resurrection), during which March 4 and 16 always fall, with the commemoration of the saints that are honored on these days.[1039] As the parallel example of the canon for the Holy Infants demonstrates, these troparia obviously belong to the original canon. The uncertainty, which is created for us by the absence of an acrostic in both these canons, is removed by the existence of an acrostic in the canon of the Infants. The hymnographer Geōrgios is also at work in all three with the same method.

## 475

**In the services of the Hours, as they are celebrated during Great Lent, an anomaly is observed in the troparia that are said in place of the kontakion (after the trisagion and all the rest and before the "Lord have mercy" forty times). How is this explained and what is correct?**

1039. Phountoulēs is describing the period prior to 1924 and the reform of the Julian Calendar in Greece.

The above question is a summary of a lengthy letter that attests to attentiveness and a critical spirit. We are sincerely sorry that by reason of its length it was impossible for us to publish the entire letter.

Indeed, the present form of this point in the service of the Hours, as it is published in our Hōrologia, is not completely smooth. The observations that are made by the inquirer are very correct: While the First Hour has only one troparion (theotokion), the Third, Sixth, and Ninth Hours have three each. This theotokion of the First Hour ("The supremely glorious...")[1040] is replaced on Wednesdays and Fridays with a staurotheotokia ("Anticipate quickly...")[1041] according to the Hōrologion, but not according to the Triōdion (Typikon of Clean Monday). The theotokion of the Third Hour ("The hope and protection..."),[1042] although it is not a staurotheotokion, is not replaced with a staurotheotokion during days pertaining to the Crucifixion.[1043] Conversely, the staurotheotokion of the Ninth Hour ("The one who bore the lamb and the shepherd...")[1044] does not give its place to a theotokion on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday. Finally, regarding the Sixth Hour, while both the first troparia are ones pertaining to the Crucifixion, "Being a source of compassion..."[1045] is a theotokion and is replaced with a staurotheotokion ("You are supremely glorified...")[1046] only on Wednesday and Friday. The opinion of the inquirer is that the Hours have their own themes, pertaining to the Crucifixion or not, and consequently the rotation of the theotokia is unnecessary, which is also certainly not a complete rotation.

And in other instances, we have been given the opportunity to say that the printed editions do not represent the most accurate tradition, they were done from what was on hand, and the repeated corrections either improved the editions or even harmed them. However, they created a tradition, which finally became prevalent rightly

1040. "Τὴν ὑπερένδοξον..."
1041. "Ταχὺ προκατάλαβε..."
1042. "Ἡ ἐλπὶς καὶ προστασία..."
1043. "σταυρώσιμες ἡμέρες."
1044. "Τὸν ἀμνὸν καὶ ποιμένα..."
1045. "Εὐσπλαγχνίας ὑπάρχουσα..."
1046. "Ὑπερδεδοξασμένη..."

or wrongly. Thus, contemporary Typika or even those a little older, and the Typika of the Holy Mountain themselves, have adapted to the taxis that we saw captured in the printed Hōrologion. In any case, the same printed editions suggest that something here "is not going well," since in precisely the parallel case of the Mesōria, again, of the printed Hōrologia, three troparia are provided for each one, consistent with the theme of the Hour (and of the Mesōrion), which were not affected by the theme of the day.

Unfortunately, the development of the service of the Hours has not been particularly studied enough for us to be able know precisely the course that our liturgical tradition followed to attain the form that exists in the printed editions. From what manuscripts that I could see in connection with this question, it appears that the whole anomaly is justified by the instability that the liturgical taxis presents on this point. This is due to the fact that the original taxis for the services of the Hours concluded at the "Our Father," namely, precisely before these troparia. The subsequent elements entered gradually and were different according to time and place.

Thus, in the most ancient surviving Hōrologion according to the taxis of Saint Sabas (*Codex Sinai 863* from the ninth century), all four services of the Hours concluded at the "Our Father." The first element that was added after the "Our Father" appears to be "Lord have mercy" forty, forty-five, twenty-four, or fifteen times and the prayer of the Hour, which is either what exists nowadays in the Hōrologia—which is usually attributed to Saint Basileios the Great—or some other. This must have taken place during the eleventh up until the thirteenth centuries, as is attested to by a series of manuscripts of the Hōrologia or Typika of this period. Hōrologia: *Paris 331* (eleventh century), *Leimōnos 295* (twelfth century), *Athens 15* (twelfth century). Typika: *Sinai 1096* (twelfth century), *Codex Athens 788* (twelfth century) of the Monastery of the Evergetis, *Codex Messina 15* (the year 1131) of Monastery of the Savior of Messina, and *Codex Vatican 1877* from the year 1292 of the Monastery of the Theotokos in "Μῆλι."[1047] However, already in certain of these manuscripts, the

1047. The name, "τοῦ Μῆλι," also spelled "τοῦ Μῖλι" (Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, 1:836) may refer to Mili San Pietro, a

start of further development is emerging. In the Sixth Hour of the *Codex Athens 15*, the troparia ("You have worked salvation..."[1048] and "You do we magnify..."[1049]) are inserted between the prokeimon, "Let your mercies quickly reach us..."[1050] and the "Our Father." In the same Hour of the *Codex Leimōnos 295*, again two troparia ("We worship your undefiled image..."[1051] and "Being a source of compassion...") are inserted between the "Our Father" and "Lord have mercy." The taxis of the Typikon of *Messina 15* appears more developed, where two troparia are each inserted in the Third, Sixth, and Ninth Hours, while the older taxis is preserved only in the First Hour. This is the Italo-Greek tradition, which appears complete in the Hōrologion of the Monastery of Kryptoferrēs;[1052] here, also the First Hour acquires its two troparia. Apart from this, it matches the Typikon of the Savior of Messina (First: "We worship your undefiled image...," "Being a source of compassion...."; Third: "O Heavenly King...,"[1053] "O Protection of Christians....";[1054] Sixth: "You have worked salvation...," "We have become partakers of divine

---

village near the city of Messina, where a former eleventh century Basilian monastery and church dedicated to the Virgin Mary are located. There is a description of the site in a publication of the Italian Ministero per I Beni e le Attività Culturali, "Chiesa di Santa Maria Mili San Pietro." Online: http://iccdold.beniculturali.it/medioevosiciliano/brochure/scheda_26.pdf. For a discussion of the architecture and basic studies of the monastery, see Charles E. Nicklies, "Builders, Patrons, and Identity: The Domed Basilicas of Sicily and Calabria," *Gesta* 43 (2004): 99–114.

1048. "Σωτηρίαν εἰργάσω..."

1049. "Σὲ μεγαλύνομεν..."

1050. "Ταχὺ προκαταλαβέτωσαν..."

1051. "Τὴν ἄχραντον εἰκόνα σου..."

1052. The text for the First Hour for the monastery of Kryptoferrēs is found in *Ὡρολόγιον σὺν Θεῷ Ἁγίῳ περιέχον τὴν ἡμερονύκτιον τῆς Ἐκκλησίας Ἀκολουθίαν τῆς Ἱερᾶς καὶ περιβλέπτου Μονῆς τῆς Κρυπτοφέρρης* (*Ἐν Κρυπτοφέρρῃ*: n.p., 1950), 91–98. This is the Monastery of Grottaferrata founded in 1004 and located near Rome. For a comparative study, see Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, "Αἱ ἀκολουθίαι τῶν ὡρῶν τοῦ νυχθημέρου κατὰ τὸ ὡρολόγιον τῆς Κρυπτοφέρρης, ἐν συγκρίσει πρὸς τὸ Κωνσταντινουπολιτικὸν ὡρολόγιον" in *La Chiesa Greca in Italia dall'VIII al XVI secolo. Atti del Convegno storico intereccleslale (Bari, 30 aprile-4 maggio 1969)*, Italia Sacra, 22 (Padova: Antenore, 1972), 2:579–588.

1053. "Βασιλεῦ οὐράνιε..."

1054. "Προστασία τῶν Χριστιανῶν..."

nature...";[1055] Ninth: "The thief when looking..."[1056] and "The one who bore the lamb and the shepherd...").

Further development took place from the thirteenth century and afterwards: an addition of yet another troparion, a generalization of the prayer, "You who at all times..."[1057] from the Midnight Office to all the Hours, an introduction of the Mesōria, and a transfer to them of the prayers of the Hours, and so forth. Both Byzantine commentators on the services of the Hours, Saint Markos Eugenikos (*Explanation of the Church's Daily Office*)[1058] and Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki (*Dialogue*, chapters 324–337) are aware of the present-day taxis, but do not go into details. Saint Markos simply notes that after the "Our Father," "again another troparion doubtless fitting to the time,"[1059] and Saint Symeōn skips it.

In all the cases above that we saw, the troparia, and naturally the theotokia, of the Hours are invariable. They are related to the themes of the Hours and are not influenced by the theme of the day, Crucifixion or not. This rotation must be relatively modern, although it is already observed in the most ancient Hōrologion, the *Codex Sinai 863*. As we saw, the troparia after the "Our Father" do not exist there, but the troparia—customarily theotokia—which are preceding the prokeimenon (namely, which is in place of the apolytikia) are adapted to the themes of Monday – Tuesday, Wednesday – Friday, and Thursday.

Let us note that this form of the service of the Hours that is considered nowadays to be proper to Great Lent (with special troparia before the prokeimenon and after the "Our Father") was originally, and is also theoretically at present, the common service for all the "ordinary"[1060] days of the year. Namely, when there is no feast or saint being celebrated, the "Alleluia" was also chanted at Matins instead of "God is the Lord."[1061] The frequent use of this form of the

1055. "Θείας γεγόναμεν..."
1056. "Βλέπων ὁ ληστής..."
1057. "Ὁ ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ..."
1058. *Ἐξήγησις ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας.*
1059. PG 160:1181b.
1060. "ἀμνήμων."
1061. "Θεὸς Κύριος..."

service—the saints celebrated at the time were few—also explains its relatively major development, which we saw in the manuscripts.

## 476

**In the Service for Holy Communion, do we perform a dismissal after the prayer, "Before the doors of your temple..."[1062]?**

## 477

**In the Divine Liturgy, why do we do a dismissal after the prayer, "O most holy Lady Theotokos the light..."[1063] after we have already done the dismissal of the Liturgy and did not begin the Thanksgiving with "Blessed is our God..."?**

## 478

**During communion, do we read the Service for Communion before communion and the Thanksgiving after it, or only some prayers?**

The "Service for Holy Communion"[1064] and the "Thanksgiving after Holy Communion"[1065] connected with it, which are contained in the Hōrologia, Hieratika, Synopses, and other separate printed books, is a later service. It cannot be strictly called a service because it does not have the known characteristics that constitute this liturgical element that is called "a service." In principle, it does not presuppose the presence of a priest, nor a community of faithful, nor does it even follow a specific liturgical schēma.

Let us remain for a moment on the form that became prevalent in our printed Hōrologia. We see that it consists of a canon ("May your Holy Body be for me the Bread of eternal life...,"[1066] in the second tone with an alphabetical acrostic), three psalms, three

1062. "Πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν τοῦ ναοῦ σου..."
1063. "Παναγία Δέσποινα Θεοτόκε τὸ φῶς..."
1064. "Ἀκολουθία τῆς θείας μεταλήψεως."
1065. "Εὐχαριστία μετὰ τὴν θέιαν μετάληψιν."
1066. "Ἄρτος ζωῆς αἰωνιζούσης..."

troparia, ten prayers, another three troparia, still also another small prayer, and five prayers of thanksgiving after communion. Intermittently, didactic verses and a few sporadic standard rubrics/instructions are inserted, which stipulate the time of their recitation and their function not in terms of the common church service, but of the individual prayer of each believer. Thus, the canon is required to be said, "after the service of Compline which is done in the evening." Naturally, the rubric is not precise because it makes provision for the canon to be inserted within Compline, in the customary place of the canons, between the Symbol of Faith and "It is truly meet...."[1067] The second part of the service, which is to be said "on the day following, after the customary eōthinēn[1068] prayer," imitates the schēma of the services of the Hours: trisagion, and all the rest, three psalms, three troparia, and prayers. The three psalms (22nd, 23rd, and 115th), which are eucharistic according to patristic commentary (22:5, "you have prepared a table before me...and your cup was supremely intoxicating"; 23:7,9 "raise up the gates...and the King of Glory shall enter"; 115:4, "I will take the cup of salvation"), were chosen either by reason of their content or because they are reminiscent of their use as koinōnika. The three troparia as well as the three following are again also chosen from other services or are appropriately arranged in order to be adapted to the theme of communion. It is characteristic that the prayers are attributed to churchmen from various periods (Basileios the Great, Chrysostomos, Iōannēs of Damascus, Symeōn Metaphrastēs, Symeōn the New Theologian, fourth–eleventh centuries). The same is also true for the prayers of thanksgiving (Basileios the Great, Symeōn Metaphrastēs), which certainly are not reputed to be "anonymous" works or of "uncertain" authorship. They are without doubt beautiful and well-written prayers, which say the same things with other (sometimes with the same) words; they prepare the believer for communion or to give thanks for it. It is clear that this is an anthology of eucharistic texts that was compiled over time with an original intention not for the

1067. "Ἄξιόν ἐστιν..."

1068. The word "eōthinēn" (ἐωθινήν) can be translated here as "early morning," rather than being associated with the eleven eōthina gospel readings.

composition of a service, but for their optional use by the faithful when they are about to approach for holy communion. This is also shown from other evidence.

In the first place, not only in the manuscripts, but also in these printed editions, disorder and lack of uniformity is observed both regarding the number and the order of the prayers. In order for us to have a convenient example, we compare the customary service of our Hōrologia with a relatively old separate printed edition with the title, *Service for Holy Communion, having been drawn up just as it is found in the old Hōrologia. This ancient taxis was appointed by the authoritative permission of the Great Church of Christ. This concise approach was intended to be useful, not only for the clergy, but also for each and every Orthodox Christian. It is published under the direction and at the expense of Stephanos K. Skatharos from Athens. In Athens, from the publishing house of Iō. Angelopoulos, 1857.*[1069] Here, there are twelve preparatory prayers before holy communion and seven for thanksgiving. Most are found in a different order than the Hōrologion, while the outline and other elements of the service are the same as the present printed editions. The prayer "of Symeōn Metaphrastēs,"[1070] "The only pure and inviolate Lord,"[1071] is third (just as also in the Hōrologion).[1072] A very lengthy prayer is treated as fourth, which is attributed to Symeōn Metaphrastēs by its title ("Another

1069. *Ἀκολουθία τῆς θείας μεταλήψεως, τεταγμένη καθὼς εὑρίσκεται εἰς τὰ παλαιὰ Ὡρολόγια. Αὕτη μὲν τάξις ἡ ἀρχαία κατετάχθη κατὰ σεβαστὴν ἔγκρισιν τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας· οὗτος δὲ ὁ συνοπτικὸς τρόπος ἐπενοήθη διὰ τὸ εὔχρηστον, ὄχι μόνον εἰς τὸν ἱερὸν κλῆρον, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς κάθε ὁποιονδήποτε ὀρθόδοξον χριστιανόν. Ἐκδίδεται ἐπιμελείᾳ καὶ δαπάνῃ Στεφάνου Κ. Σκαθάρου τοῦ ἐξ' Ἀθήνας. Ἐν Ἀθήναις, ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου Ἰω. Ἀγγελοπούλου, 1857.*

1070. Symeōn Metaphrastēs (Συμεών ὁ Μεταφράστης), a saint celebrated on November 28, lived during the second half of the tenth century and was known for his composition of a Mēnologion in ten volumes that contains 146 lives of the saints organized according to the church calendar. For additional information, see Fr. Halkin, "Συμεών. Ὁ Μεταφράστης," *ΘΗΕ* 11:536 and Alexander Kazhdan and Nancy Paterson Ševčenko, "Symeon Metaphrastes," *ODB* 3:1983–1984.

1071. "Ὁ μόνος καθαρὸς καὶ ἀκήρατος Κύριος..."

1072. In the translation of this paragraph, the order of treatment of the fourth and third prayers are reversed from Phountoulēs's text because otherwise his description of the fourth prayer's contents would follow in the wrong order.

prayer of his").[1073] "It begins with the phrase, "That standing before your fearful and impartial tribunal, O Christ God...,"[1074] and refers to the same things with other themes: confession of sinfulness and petition for forgiveness and remission of sins for worthy participation in the undefiled mysteries. It exudes much piety, but also with holy and unfeigned sincerity, confesses the multitude of sins, into which, at least supposedly, the Christian has fallen, and literally lists a multitude of explicit and unutterable sins. Especially regarding this prayer (as well as regarding the prayer after the sixth gospel of the service of unction), the elder Gabriël of blessed memory, prior-abbot[1075] of the Sacred Monastery of Dionysiou of the Holy Mountain, said to me and wrote to me years ago, with the critical spirit and sobriety of mind that distinguished him, that it ought to be removed from this collection of prayers for holy communion because of the unacceptable descriptions of unspeakable, imaginary and actual, sins of the flesh. However, the editors of modern editions have already made sure to remove it. These things are incidental.

Likewise, it is characteristic that in this edition of 1857 after the fifth prayer of thanksgiving after holy communion, there is the word "end"[1076] and then, two similar prayers are added as an appendix. Indeed, the first, which is entitled, "Prayer after holy communion,"[1077] is formulated in the popular religious language of the Tourkokratia:[1078] "O my All-holy Savior, I consider what words I find within myself in order to greet you and what gift to make for you in order to express thanks to you, in a proper manner; but I find nothing wherein to be worthy...."[1079] However, also other

1073. "Εὐχὴ ἑτέρα τοῦ αὐτοῦ."

1074. "Ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ φοβεροῦ σου καὶ ἀπροσωπολήπτου παρεστηκὼς βήματος, Χριστὲ ὁ Θεός..."

1075. The term, "ὁ προηγούμενος," is an honorific title given to a former abbot, who no longer holds the office.

1076. "τέλος."

1077. "Προσευχὴ μετὰ τὴν ἁγίαν κοινωνίαν."

1078. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

1079. "Ὦ πανάγιε Σωτῆρά μου, λογιάζω μέσα μου τὶ λόγια νὰ εὕρω διὰ νὰ σὲ χαιρετήσω καὶ ποῖον χάρισμα νὰ σὲ κάμω διὰ νὰ σοὶ εὐχαριστήσω, καθὼς πρέπει· ἀμὴ τίποτε δὲν εὑρίσκω, ὅπου νὰ εἶναι ἄξιον..."

prayers before or after holy communion were written by other authors, named or unnamed, and are found in manuscripts or are published in prayer books or collections of prayers. As an example, I cite the prayer before holy communion of Saint Symeōn, archbishop of Thessaloniki, and the supplicatory prayer "to the Lady Theotokos... especially at the time one wishes to commune"[1080] of an anonymous writer, which is published in the "Prayer book" of Simōnōph.[1081]

It has already become clear that the "service" of communion is not a true service, but personal prayer. This is not only verified by its few standard rubrics, but also by the fact that no mention is made anywhere regarding the participation of a priest or deacon ("Blessed is our God...," dismissal, diaconal petitions, and so forth), and certainly by its manner of formulating the troparia and prayers. All the troparia and all the prayers are clearly personal prayers, written in the singular form, which presupposes a single privately praying believer, who is also preparing in this way for his/her approach to the undefiled Mysteries or giving thanks after his/her participation in the Lord's Supper. It is clear that this "service" so started and thus continues up until nowadays. The fact that by exception it is read jointly during group (family or community) participation in holy communion, or jointly by priests about to concelebrate, or during the synaxis, especially during vigils, has not altered its personal character. It remained and remains on the margins of liturgical life and for precisely this reason it does not have those elements that compose, characterize, and frame actual services, mainly both the enarxis with "Blessed is our God..." and the conclusion with the dismissal.

And so far, things are clear and correct: The believer, clergy or laity, before his/her approach to holy communion prepares himself/herself in a variety of ways. One of them is also prayer. Our church tradition formulated a type of such prayer with the collection of hymns and preparatory prayers for holy communion and thanks-

1080. "εἰς τὴν κυρίαν Θεοτόκον... ἐν ᾧ καιρῷ μάλιστα τις βούλεται μεταλαβεῖν."

1081. Ἀνδρέας Δ. Σιμώνωφ, *Μέγα Προσευχητάριον, περιέχον ἱερᾶς προσευχὰς ἐν πάσῃ περιστάσει καὶ ῥήματα ἱερά· περὶ προσευχῆς, μετανοίας, ἐξομολογήσεως, μεταλήψεως, καὶ ἀναγνώσεως τῶν θείων γραφῶν* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου Π.Α. Πετράκου, 1906).

giving after it. Precisely the relative fluidity of the collection up until the domination of printed editions, and after this, shows that what eventually became prevalent and is contained in our Hōrologia is not the only way of praying, preparing, or giving thanks. However, matters are complicated—I can say that they are intermingled both inopportunely and carelessly—when these personal prayers and troparia are interwoven with the formal text, which represents the Church's taxis in its public and common prayer and worship, namely, in the Divine Liturgy. The Divine Liturgy, according to the taxis historically maintained, in all forms that it is found formulated and where it is celebrated with them throughout the entire Christian ecumene, contains within its text the proper preparation for holy communion and after it the fitting thanksgiving of the entire Church, namely, of the clergy and people. Preparation takes place nearly in all the liturgical forms stereotypically with a prayer that introduces the Lord's Prayer—and the latter in a eucharistic sense ("Our Father.... give us today our daily bread")—as well as a prayer of inclination, namely, of blessing for those about to commune. The invitation follows for communion ("The Holy Things are for the holy"[1082]—later, "With the fear of God..."[1083]), the communion of clergy and people is covered with appropriate chanting, usually hortatory regarding holy communion (the koinōnikon), and the prayer of thanksgiving follows after holy communion ("after all commune").[1084] The prayers are composed (as well as the entire Divine Liturgy) in the plural form, namely, they concern the totality of the Christian community. They are sober, short, laconic, and, in brief, "decent" in the good sense, and are introduced with diaconal exhortations appropriate for the circumstance.

These elements are also in force for the Byzantine liturgical form, which is observed nowadays throughout the entire Orthodox Church (Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great, Chrysostomos, and Presanctified). For example, in the Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great, the preparation is done with the prayer, "Our God, the God

1082. "Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις."
1083. "Μετὰ φόβου Θεοῦ..."
1084. "μετὰ τὸ πάντας μεταλαβεῖν."

who saves, you teach us..."[1085] and the prayer of inclination, "Lord Master, the Father of mercies and God of every consolation...,"[1086] and thanksgiving consists in the prayer, "We give thanks to you, O Lord our God, for the communion...."[1087] These are introduced, as is well known, with the diaconal petitions, "For the precious Gifts offered and consecrated...may in return send down upon us divine grace and the gift of the Holy Spirit"[1088] (being understood for holy communion) and "Arise. Having partaken...let us worthily give thanks to the Lord."[1089] Immediately after the elevation, the breaking of the Holy Bread, the commixture with the Precious Blood, and the pouring of the zeon, according to the ancient taxis and old reliable manuscripts, the priest proceeds, without any interference and delay, to the communion of himself and of the deacon and, afterwards, of the people, and, after the communion and the transfer of the remaining Elements and the vessels to the skeuophylakion (later to the prothesis), to the prayer of thanksgiving and to the dismissal customary in every era, without anything additional.

However, already by the end of the Byzantine period in the *Diataxeis* of the Divine Liturgy and in liturgical manuscripts of that epoch, provision is made that the priest while holding the particle of the Holy Bread that he is about to partake, says "by himself" the troparion "Of your mystical supper...."[1090] He says this only and communes. Still after the Divine Liturgy and the consumption of the Holy Elements, the priest and the deacon say privately "Now let your servant depart...,"[1091] the trisagion and all the rest, troparia, and "Lord have mercy" three or twelve times and make a new dismissal (*Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy*, twelfth–thirteenth centuries. See P. Trempelas, *The Three Liturgies According to the Co-*

1085. "Ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ σῴζειν, σύ ἡμᾶς δίδαξον..."

1086. "Δέσποτα Κύριε, ὁ Πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν καὶ Θεὸς πάσης παρακλήσεως..."

1087. "Εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι, Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἐπὶ τῇ μεταλήψει..."

1088. "Ὑπὲρ τῶν προσκομισθέντων καὶ ἁγιασθέντων τιμίων Δώρων... ἀντικαταπέμψῃ ἡμῖν τὴν θείαν χάριν καὶ τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος."

1089. "Ὀρθοί· μεταλαβόντες... ἀξίως εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ."

1090. "Τοῦ δείπνου σου τοῦ μυστικοῦ..."

1091. "Νῦν ἀπολύεις..."

*dices in Athens*, Athens 1935, pp. 13–14).[1092] In the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos (fourteenth century) and in its contemporary manuscripts, we observe that these personal preparatory prayers are increased, but without yet losing proportion. The brief prayers, "I believe, O Lord, and confess..."[1093] and the even shorter, "May not unto judgment or in condemnation be..."[1094] (P. Trempelas, as above) are added. In late manuscripts from the era of the Tourkokratia[1095] and in printed editions, this tendency for interpolation of ill-timed additions of prayers and troparia before and after holy communion assumes catalytic proportions for the normal conducting of the Divine Liturgy. Before holy communion, a multitude of troparia are gradually added, relevant or irrelevant (for example, "I have sinned before you, O Savior...,"[1096] "I cry out to you, O Christ Savior...,"[1097] "Overlook my transgression, O Lord...,"[1098] "In the partaking of your Holy Elements...,"[1099] "How shall I who am unworthy enter into the splendor of your saints?"[1100] "You have smitten me with yearning, O Christ...,"[1101] "As the prodigal son...,"[1102] "As the man who fell among the thieves..."[1103] "Every man wherever he is saved...,"[1104] "O Heavenly King...,"[1105] "O Lord, who did send down at the third hour your All-holy Spirit...,"[1106] and all the rest), as well as hortatory verses and prayers, for the most part, derived from, as we saw, the personal prayers of the Service for Holy Communion. After holy communion, again new troparia are

1092. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 13–14.
1093. "Πιστεύω, Κύριε, καὶ ὁμολογῶ..."
1094. "Μὴ εἰς κρίμα ἢ εἰς κατάκριμα γένοιτο..."
1095. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.
1096. "Ἥμαρτον εἰς σὲ Σωτήρ..."
1097. "Κράζω σοι, Χριστὲ Σωτήρ..."
1098. "Τὰς ἀνομίας μου πάριδε Κύριε..."
1099. "Εἰς τὴν μετάληψιν τῶν ἁγιασμάτων σου..."
1100. "Ἐν ταῖς λαμπρότησι τῶν ἁγίων σου..."
1101. "Ἐθελξας πόθῳ με, Χριστέ..."
1102. "Ὡς ὁ ἄσωτος υἱός..."
1103. "Ὡς ὁ περιπεσὼν εἰς τοὺς ληστάς..."
1104. "Ἕκαστος ὅπου σώζεται..."
1105. "Βασιλεῦ οὐράνιε..."
1106. "Κύριε, ὁ τὸ Πανάγιόν σου Πνεῦμα..."

interpolated, usually the ninth ode of the canon of Pascha, as well as verses and prayers from the Thanksgiving after Holy Communion or similar collections. In extreme cases, we encounter the recitation of an entire or nearly entire Service for Holy Communion and more commonly of the Thanksgiving after it, before the "Now let your servant depart..."[1107] and all the rest, which we saw that they already appear from the twelfth–thirteenth centuries.

And for us to conclude this long retrospection, which was done precisely in order to make the conclusions self-evident: The "Service for Holy Communion" and the "Thanksgiving after Holy Communion" are collections of hymns and preparatory prayers for holy communion and thanksgiving after it, of personal use, most beneficial and very conducive for preparation, as much as humanly possible, for approaching the undefiled Mysteries and for fitting thanksgiving afterwards. This—its distinct character—also explains its peculiar form, to which the first two questions refer. It does not begin and does not end as normal services do.

Its place is outside of the Divine Liturgy, during the hours of the faithful's personal prayer. The Divine Liturgy has its own collective preparation and thanksgiving for holy communion, which pertains to the entire community when partaking in the undefiled Mysteries. Consequently, the interpolation of this service for reasons of piety, or even part of it, at the time of the koinōnikon or after it, prolongs the Divine Liturgy for no reason, is not consistent with the old, sober, and correct practice, and both slackens and weakens the robust collective fabric of the Divine Liturgy, when turning it into a personal practice of piety. Our impiety alone does not corrupt the Liturgy, but, perhaps more so, our excessive "piety," insubmissive to venerable tradition.[1108]

1107. "Νῦν ἀπολύεις..."

1108. For a study of the preparatory and thanksgiving prayers, see Stefanos Alexopoulos and Annewies van den Hoek, "The Endicott Scroll and Its Place in the History of Private Communion Prayers," *DOP* 60 (2006): 145–188.

## 479

**Is it permitted for a priest who is not about to serve to do the proskomidē with only the epitrachēlion?**

The answer is clearly negative regarding both its parts. Another priest apart from that one who will be serving cannot perform the proskomidē, nor when wearing only the epitrachēlion, whether he will be the celebrant, or worse, another priest. This is disorder, which good intentions do not pardon, not even the otherwise noble disposition for serving and assisting the celebrant priest.

The priest who would serve is obligated to perform the proskomidē after he takes kairos and puts on his whole priestly vestment. This constitutes not only the "technical" so to speak preparation of the gifts for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, as in the past, but also a type of sacred-service, "an anticipation" and a prefiguration of the Divine Liturgy by which the eucharistic species are offered and presented to God, as it has taken shape in the relatively modern taxis, but maintained for centuries. This becomes clear both from what is done and said during the proskomidē, the honor that is bestowed upon the gifts (incense—kissing), and, especially, from the prayer of the prothesis, through which the priest calls on God that He might bless "this prothesis" and receive it on His heavenly altar. Moreover, the standard rubrics that exist in codices, the printed editions, and the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of the Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos are unambiguous; the celebrant priest does the proskomidē and no one else.

And in addition, the commentaries of the holy Fathers on the Divine Liturgy are twice as interesting regarding our topic, not only because they confirm what the standard rubrics explicitly record, but also because they emphasize the sacredness of the practice of the proskomidē, its unity with the Divine Liturgy, and its theological importance. For example, we cite what the sacred Nikolaos Kabasilas writes in his *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy.* Concerning the words of the priest, "In remembrance of our Lord and God...,"[1109] which precede the excision of the Lamb (also associating them

1109. "Εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ..."

with the word of the Lord, "Do this in remembrance of me," Luke 22:19, 1 Cor 11:24–25), he integrates the proskomidē into the whole Liturgy, which is done "in remembrance"[1110] of the Lord, and emphasizes the unity of the proskomidē and Liturgy, when considering the first "a beginning"[1111] of the second ("And he speaks not only concerning that bread, but regarding all the rite, as if to begin hence the sacred-service," chapter 7).[1112] And elsewhere when commenting on the meaning of the offering of the particles, he repeats that those things "from the beginning, by which the death of the Lord was signified... which are pronounced once, are intended to be said for the whole rite [proskomidē and Liturgy]. In fact, the offering of the gifts takes place entirely in remembrance of the Lord, and through the whole His death is proclaimed" (chapter 10).[1113] He especially considers the proskomidē an imitation of the Lord's action, when during the mystical supper "having taken bread and wine in his hands, he dedicated them to God the Father, presenting them as gifts to Him and, setting them apart, dedicated them to Him."[1114] The Church also does this with the proskomidē, when dedicating the gifts to the Lord. With this rite, the bread and wine "both become and are called precious gifts to God" (chapter 2).[1115]

Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki calls the proskomidē, "the prelude of the sacred-service" (*Dialogue*, chapter 83),[1116] the gifts "divine" and "precious," "an offering to God," and "antitypes" of the Body and Blood of Christ, and for which reason worthy of honor and worship, "since they are sanctified by the offering, are hallowed by the most divine prayers, and are the antitypes of the Body of Christ and his Blood." And this is because "they have been offered to God in the

1110. "εἰς ἀνάμνησιν."

1111. "ἀρχή."

1112. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 7.2 (SC 4bis:84–85). The text differs slightly from the critical edition.

1113. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 10.1 (SC 4bis:92–93).

1114. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 2.6 (SC 4bis:72–73).

1115. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 2.5 (SC 4bis:72–73).

1116. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 181

prothesis and the priest offered a prayer at that point and asked that they be received on the altar on high" (*Explanation*, 78).[1117]

Some priests who are accustomed to do what the question is referring to or even put up with the interference of other priests or deacons, when they are not concelebrants, also invoke certain historical/traditional grounds. Namely, that originally deacons performed the proskomidē and that in the hierarchial Liturgy, the hierarch/celebrant only steps in towards the end of the proskomidē, namely, from the blessing of the commixture of the chalice. Both these arguments are historically and ritually true. However, the deacons who performed the proskomidē, apart from the fact that they were concelebrants and not simply ones who happened to find themselves in the bēma, also ceased here for centuries to have this privilege. Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki observes characteristically: "[The deacons] do not have the gift of offering the prothesis to God. For deacons have only the 'liturgic' dignity" (*Dialogue*, chapter 96).[1118] It is attested to that up until the end of the Byzantine period in Thessaloniki and on the Holy Mountain, as it is also confirmed by the *Diataxis* of Philotheos, deacons commemorated names and excised portions during the proskomidē.[1119] However, still Saint Symeōn considers that it "does not follow good order and is not appropriate,"[1120] and forbids it (*Dialogue*, chapter 96), obviously as inconsistent with the taxis of the Great Church, which he knew well as a Constantinopolitan. Moreover, while in the hierarchical Liturgy, a more archaic taxis is preserved, yet one of the concelebrating priests does the proskomidē up until the point that we cite, and not one of the non-concelebrating priests. While he has not taken kairos—because only the hierarch takes kairos, who is the principal celebrant—nevertheless, he has received a blessing and has put on his entire priestly vestment according to the taxis.

Regarding the importance of the proskomidē and the necessity of maintaining precise taxis during its performance, we wrote earlier

1117. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 129.
1118. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 239.
1119. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 4.
1120. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 239.

on the occasion of two related questions. The one (number 297) related to the use of the knife instead of the lance and the other (number 317) as to whether the priest can perform the proskomidē before he takes kairos and puts on the sacred vestments. The correct taxis is being violated by an undoubtedly good intention. For its justification, technical difficulties are enlisted, or some pseudo-traditional historical cover is sought. Regarding all these flippant initiatives of ours, Saint Symeōn would say: "This does not follow good order and is not appropriate. And one ought to pay attention to this" (*Dialogue*, chapter 96).[1121]

## 480

**In the Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great, during the consecration of the precious gifts, there are differences in our liturgical texts regarding the third blessing. And some provide, "Τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς καὶ σωτηρίας" (Shed for the life and salvation of the world), and others, "Μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ Ἁγίῳ" (Changing them by your Holy Spirit). Which is the correct one?**

## 481

**In the printed editions of the "Hieratikon" of the Apostolikē Diakonia, there are inconsistencies regarding the phrase, "Μεταβαλών..." (Changing...) in the Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great. Some have it and others do not. Should it be said or not be said?**

It would not be necessary for us to return to this topic because answer number 330 to the query relevant to the questions above gave, as I believe, the majority of the elements, on the basis of which it is proven that "Μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ Ἁγίῳ" (Changing them by your Holy Spirit) in the Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great is an interpolation foreign to its original text and unacceptable. However, we again return on the occasion of the two questions above, which arose from the recent (1987) republication of the "Hieratikon" of

1121. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*, 239.

1977 by the Apostolikē Diakonia, where the contested phrase existed. We will endeavor not to repeat what we wrote at the time by summarizing those things and adding new elements, since what was written there was perhaps not judged persuasive. In any case, we request that all those interested also read that answer.

In the printed editions of the Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great which are contained in the Great Euchologia or in the Hieratika of the 1858 and 1875 printed editions of Constantinople, the 1862 of Venice, and the 1927 of Athens (Saliveros), "Μεταβαλών..." (Changing...) does not exist. A note is placed at this point, which is also the same one verbatim in these four editions, "'Μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ Ἁγίῳ' [Changing them by your Holy Spirit], copied from the Divine Liturgy of Chrysostomos, when considered on the basis of syntax has no place here in that of Basileios the Great, but is an addition, which was audaciously made by someone, as also Nikodēmos noted in his *Pēdalion* (canon 19 of the Council in Laodicea)."[1122] Ecumenical Patriarch Kōnstantios I[1123] most likely must have composed this note, since it was encountered for the first time, at least insofar as I know, in the referenced edition of 1858, where in the title of which, on the back of the flyleaf, and in the prologue ("announcement")[1124] it is recorded that it has been "meticulously" scrutinized and enriched "with well-devised [or indispensable] notes from His All-Holiness and Eminence Patriarch Kōnstantios I of Constantinople from Sinai." The Patriarch refers to Saint Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain, who with stern words condemns this addition and makes a reasonable hypothesis regarding its origins:

---

1122. For examples of the note's reproduction in these editions, see N. K. Πρωτοψαλτίδης, *Αἱ Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι τῶν ἐν Ἁγίοις Πατέρων ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου καὶ Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου σὺν τῇ τῶν Προηγιασμένων, μετὰ τοῦ Λυχνικοῦ Ὄρθρου, καὶ τοῦ Ἱεροδιακονικοῦ, Ἀκριβῶς ἐπιθεωρηθεῖσαι καὶ πλουτισθεῖσαι δι' ὑποσημειώσεων περιέργων, παρὰ τοῦ παναγιωτάτου καὶ σεβασμιωτάτου Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Κωνσταντίου τοῦ Α'. τοῦ ἀπὸ Σιναίου* (Κωνσταντινούπολις: ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1875), 133; and *Εὐχολόγιον τὸ Μέγα: ἀναθεωρηθὲν καὶ διὰ παντοίων σημειώσεων καὶ νέων εὐχῶν πλουτισθέν. Ἐπιμελείᾳ Νικ. Παν. Παπαδοπούλου, Πρωτοπρεσβυτέρου* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Ἰ. Σαλίβερος, 1927), 64.

1123. Kōnstantios I of Constantinople (1770–1859, r. 1830–1834).

1124. "ἀγγελία."

"because this is an addition of some ignorant and audacious person, who being opposed, it would seem, to the Latins, took these words from the Liturgy of Chrysostomos and put them into the Liturgy of Basileios...but neither do such words have a place there according to syntax."[1125] Both Blessed Nikodēmos and Patriarch Kōnstantios (if ultimately he is the author of the note) are completely correct for the following reasons:

1. The phrase, "Μεταβαλών..." (Changing...), is not encountered in the Liturgy of Basileios the Great in all the ancient and reliable manuscripts from the most ancient Euchologion (*Barberini 336*) of the eighth century up until the fifteenth century. The professor Panagiōtēs Trempelas, who in his critical edition of the three Liturgies (1935) used more than eighty-five codices mainly from the National Library of Greece and the Byzantine Museum of Athens, encountered this addition in twenty-six manuscripts, the oldest of which is *Athens 661* from the fifteenth century, and indeed in it (as well as in *Byzantine Museum 14* from the sixteenth century) the addition has been added by a second hand in the margin. All other manuscripts are later: four from the sixteenth, eleven from the seventeenth, and nine from the eighteenth centuries. The remaining nearly sixty manuscripts, which are older and more reliable,

---

1125. Ἀγάπιος ἱερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982), 428, n. 3. Translation adapted from D. Cummings, trans., *The Rudder (Pedalion) of the Metaphorical Ship of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of the Orthodox Christians, or all the sacred and divine canons of the holy and renowned apostles, of the holy councils, ecumenical as well as regional, and of the individual divine Fathers, as embodied in the original Greek text, for the sake of authenticity, and explained in the vernacular by way of rendering them more intelligible to the less educated by Agapius, A Hiermonach and Nicodemus, a monk and diligently redacted at the instance of His Superlative All-Holiness and of the Sacred and Holy Synod by Seignior Dorotheus, and Erudite Teacher and Preacher, first printed and published (AD 1800) by permission and exhortation and order of the Superlatively All-Holy and Ecumenical Patriarch and of the Holy Synod, under the supervision of Theodoret (Ath.) of Ioannina, one among the hieromonachs. The whole now faithfully translated into English from the fifth edition published by John Nicolaides (Kesioglou the Caesarean) in Athens, Greece 1908* (Chicago: The Orthodox Christian Educational Society, 1983), 561.

do not have it. In many of the manuscripts that contain the addition, "Μεταβαλών..." (Changing...), the typical anomaly caused is visible, which precisely reveals the later interpolation in the text; namely, while most of the manuscripts provide "Μεταβαλών..." (Changing...) during this third blessing of the gifts (they attach, "τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς καὶ σωτηρίας" [shed for the life and salvation of the world], to, "τὸ δὲ ποτήριον τοῦτο αὐτὸ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ" [This cup to be the precious Blood of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ]), others introduce "Μεταβαλών..." (Changing...) as a fourth blessing, and two (*Athens 776* of the sixteenth century and *Byzantine Museum 86* of the seventeenth) remove the whole text of the invocation of Basileios the Great, "τὸν μὲν ἄρτον...τὸ δὲ ποτήριον... κόσμου ζωῆς" (this bread...this cup...life of the world"), and replace it with the corresponding text from the Liturgy of Chrysostomos, "καὶ ποίησον...τῷ ἁγίῳ" (and make...by your Holy Spirit).

2. "Μεταβαλών..." (Changing...) does not exist in the Liturgy of Basileios the Great in most printed editions of the Great Euchologion and Hieratikon: Venice 1832, 1862, and 1881.[1126] Constantinople 1820 (Archieratikon), 1858, 1875, and 1895.[1127] Athens 1865, 1892, 1923, 1927, and 1948 (*Hierotelestikon* by Chrysostomos of Philppi and Neapolis),[1128] unknown date (Sotērios Gioulēs).[1129] Rome 1950 ("Hieratikon"). Apostolikē Diakonia 1951, 1962, and 1971.[1130] However, in other printed editions, there are variants analogous to those that we encountered in the manuscripts, such as: Venice 1760, 1795, and 1848.[1131] Rome 1873 (Great Euchologion). Apostolikē Diakonia (Archieratikon) 1971, 1977, and 1987.[1132] In the monumental edition of J. Goar, both types exist, with "Μεταβαλών..." (Changing...)

1126. The first two dates most likely refer to Great Euchologia.

1127. The last three publication dates most likely refer to Hieratika.

1128. Χρυσόστομος Φιλίππων καὶ Νεαπόλεως, *Ἱεροτελεστικόν* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1948).

1129. The first four publication dates most likely refer to Hieratika.

1130. These publication dates most likely refer to Hieratika.

1131. These publication dates most likely refer to Hieratika.

1132. The last two publication dates most likely refer to Hieratika.

(p. 144) and without it (pp. 151 and 155—*Codex Pyromali*).[1133] Our intention was not to look at all the printed editions, which is not only impossible, but also pointless since most are repeating previous ones. We only saw the ones that we had on hand at our disposal.[1134]

3. The fact that "Μεταβαλών..." (Changing...) does not belong to the original text of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great is also shown from the text itself of this Liturgy. The invocation has the following form: "Σοῦ δεόμεθα καὶ σὲ παρακαλοῦμεν, ἅγιε ἁγίων,... ἐλθεῖν τὸ Πνεῦμα σου τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα καὶ εὐλογῆσαι αὐτὰ καὶ ἁγιάσαι καὶ ἀναδεῖξαι τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον... τὸ δὲ ποτήριον τοῦτο... τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς" (We pray to you and call upon you, holy of holies...that your Holy Spirit may come upon us and upon the gifts here presented, to bless, sanctify, and show forth; this bread...this cup...shed for the life and salvation of the world).[1135] The meaning is complete. "Τὸ ἐκχυθέν" (shed) is an adjectival participle, a qualifier that is referring to the Blood of the Lord that was shed once for all upon the Cross. Namely, it belongs to the second part of the invocation, the blessing of the cup. The gifts are already consecrated. Immediately afterwards, as in all the Liturgies, the results of the participation of the faithful in the undefiled Mysteries are enumerated: "Ἡμᾶς δὲ πάντας τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου μετέχοντας ἑνώσαις ἀλλήλοις..." (And unite us all to one another who become partakers of the one Bread and Cup...).[1136]

The parallel text of the Liturgy of Chrysostomos has another structure: "Παρακαλοῦμεν σε καὶ δεόμεθα καὶ ἱκετεύομεν κατάπεμψον τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα. Καὶ ποίησον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον....τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τούτῳ...

1133. Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 144, 151, and 155.

1134. Notes were added to clarify which service books are being referenced.

1135. Translation modified from *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Among the Saints Basil the Great, A New Translation by Members of the Faculty of Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1988), 30.

1136. Translation modified from *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Among the Saints Basil the Great, A New Translation by Members of the Faculty of Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1988), 31.

μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ" (We beseech and pray and entreat you: Send down your Holy Spirit upon us and upon these gifts here presented. And make this bread...And that which is in this cup...changing them by your Holy Spirit).[1137] Here also the meaning is complete. "Μεταβαλών..." (Changing...) is a participle in the second aorist tense, which semantically is immediately tied to "κατάπεμψον" (send down) and qualifies the condition of consecrating the gifts, where it takes place by the activity of the Holy Spirit: "τῷ Πνεύματι σου τῷ ἁγίῳ (by your Holy Spirit)—a dative that shows the means. In the two preceding phrases, which are dependent upon "ποίησον" (make), the entreaty is made specific to both eucharistic species, where, by the activity of the Holy Spirit, the bread will become the Body of Christ and that which is in the cup the Blood of Christ. Here also immediately after the consecratory phrases, the fruits of the participation of the faithful in the mystery are mentioned: "Ὥστε γενέσθαι τοῖς μεταλαμβάνουσιν εἰς νῆψιν ψυχῆς..." (So that they may be for those who partake of them for vigilance of soul...).[1138]

In that answer (number 330), we add the comments of Saint Nikolaos Kabasilas and cited the parallels to other ancient Liturgies, which are not necessary to be repeated.

4. The addition of "Μεταβαλών..." (Changing...) to the Liturgy of Basileios the Great causes an anomaly in syntax, unjustifiable for a literary text flawless from all points of view such as the anaphora of Basileios the Great. Blessed Nikodēmos notes it and calls the person "ignorant"[1139] who did this, because "neither do such words have a place there according to syntax." The patriarch Kōnstantios likewise notes: "when considered on the basis of syntax has no place here."

---

1137. Translation modified from *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Among the Saints John Chrysostom, Greek and English text approved by the Ecumenical Patriarchate for us in the Parishes of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America* (New York, NY: Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, 2018), 33.

1138. *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Among the Saints John Chrysostom, Greek and English text approved by the Ecumenical Patriarchate for us in the Parishes of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America* (New York, NY: Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, 2018), 34.

1139. "ἀμαθῆ."

The phrase "ἐλθεῖν τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον... εὐλογῆσαι... ἁγιάσαι.... ἀναδεῖξαι" (Your Holy Spirit to come...to bless...to sanctify...to show forth) is precisely the meaning that is concisely contained in "μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ" (changing them by your Holy Spirit) of the Liturgy of Chrysostomos, which is formulated more fully and theologically in the Liturgy of Basileios the Great. "Μεταβαλὼν..." (Changing...) in the Liturgy of Chrysostomos is found grammatically and syntactically acceptable in a linguistic context with a harmony of style. Its subject is God the Father, to whom the Church offers her rational and bloodless sacrifice and entreats Him to send down His Holy Spirit for the sanctification of her gifts, since He (God the Father) changes them through the Holy Spirit into the Body and Blood of Christ. In contrast, the infinitives of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great (εὐλογῆσαι/to bless... ἁγιάσαι/to sanctify... ἀναδεῖξαι/to show forth) have the Holy Spirit for their subject. With the addition of the participle "μεταβαλών" (changing) the acceptable text becomes unacceptable. Apart from the fact that it adds nothing semantically, since the meaning of the change is periphrastically expressed, as we saw, with the infinitives, it complicates and ruins it syntactically. If it existed in the original text, where a reason did not exist for it to exist, it would be in an infinitive with its subject in the accusative: "ἐλθεῖν τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον... καὶ εὐλογήσαι αὐτὰ καὶ ἁγιάσαι καὶ ἀναδεῖξαι [καὶ μεταβαλεῖν]" (your Holy Spirit to come ...and to bless and to sanctify and to show them forth [and to change]." It is evident that "μεταβαλών" (changing) is a "foreign body."

How then did the addition of "Μεταβαλών..." (Changing...) come into the Liturgy of Basileios the Great? Likely Blessed Nikodémos is correct when expressing the suspicion that someone "audacious"—"ignorant" as has been proven true from what we have seen up until now—"who being opposed to the Latins" made the addition. If that is so, he would seek in this way to make the invocation of the Holy Spirit more unequivocal, naturally in opposition to the theological teaching of the Westerners regarding the sanctification of the precious gifts with the words of institution for the mystery

("Take, eat, this is my Body…" "Drink…this is my Blood…"). Naturally, it is naïve for us to believe that he thus succeeded.

However, perhaps liturgical reasons also contributed, which in answer number 330 we explained in detail. The blessing of the precious gifts took place originally twice for reasons of consecration, namely once for the bread and once for the cup. All the texts of the ancient Liturgies presuppose this, even also those of our well-known Liturgies of the Byzantine liturgical form in current use, namely, the Liturgies of Basileios the Great and the sacred Chrysostomos.

When later the three blessings were introduced according to the type of the Holy Trinity, which constitutes a commonplace in our liturgical practices (sometimes opportunely, and at other times inopportunely, as we saw in the triple communion from the holy chalice "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit"),[1140] the triple blessing of the precious gifts also became prevalent. And for the first two (the bread and the cup) the phrases of blessing already existed, which accompanied them from the beginning. Regarding the third blessing for the Liturgy of Chrysostomos—which was the one more commonly performed during the later period — the solution was found in the combination of this third blessing with "μεταβαλών" (changing), despite the weakness of the phrase. If from the beginning the phrase had a character of a blessing, it would have been in the imperative, just as "κατάπεμψον (send down) … ποίησον (make)." Namely, "μεταβαλών" (changing) would not be said, but rather "μετάβαλε" (change). However, in the Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great, there were more difficulties. Finally, the solution became prevalent for "ἐκχυθέν" (shed…) to be detached from its context and bear the burden of the third blessing. The word "ἐκχυθέν" (shed…) refers to the preceding phrase "τὸ δὲ ποτήριον… αἷμα…" ("the cup… Blood…") and is only referring to it and not to both species, as at least occurred with "μεταβαλών" (changing) from the Liturgy of Chrysostomos. Nevertheless, in any case, this form became prevalent, although the weakness of the situation was and is apparent. Someone "audacious"[1141] (for us to use the charac-

1140. Phountoulēs is referring to question 107.

1141. "τολμηρός."

terization of Blessed Nikodemos) came to heal this with a "transplant" (for us to use here a contemporary term from medicine) of a phrase, which already accompanied the third blessing in the Liturgy of Chrysostomos. Naturally, it is clear that the transplant of a foreign body has failed, while also at the same time ruining the robust structure of the anaphora of Basileios the Great.

What would be more preferable, for the sickness of this point of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great to remain—namely, the combination of the third blessing with a phrase not associated with blessing—or to combine incompatible things recruited from the Liturgy of Chrysostomos and an interpolation of an equally problematic, but in any case, less sick phrase of blessing? I have the opinion that there is no doubt that our interpolations into sacred texts operate within certain limits, which if we exceed them, we place ourselves in the position of being a judge and regulator of matters that do not belong to individuals, but to the Church. Especially the weight and importance of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great is something that is difficult for us to be able to estimate. It is the most solemn Liturgy of our Church, and for this reason it is celebrated during the most solemn feasts. It has been celebrated and is celebrated thousands of times by the Church, which with it expresses its faith and offers its worship to God and with it performs its supreme mystery of life and of its existence, the Holy Eucharist. Tradition attributes it to Basileios the Great, one of its most famous holy Fathers and Teachers, and, also nowadays, scientific and critical study of the text of its anaphora is coming to confirm this, completely impartially. To attempt interpretation of texts of such a kind with our theology is our imperative duty. To misinterpret them is in any event human. However, to impose our theology on them when removing or, worse, adding whatever our theology dictates to us, is unpardonable. Either Basileios the Great did not correctly formulate the invocation, and consequently the Church did not correctly celebrate the mystery for so many centuries, and by necessity we owe a favor to him who came to correct it in order to make it clearer or in order to take a stand against the Latins or in order "to tidy up" the gap of the third

blessing by adding "μεταβαλών" (changing) or his own—and, in this case, our own—"theology" is unorthodox.

If the replacement of two words in a troparion (in "O Lord save your people...,"[1142] see the note at the end of the answer), which has a completely temporal character, has created so much controversy, it is a wonder that the uncritical and completely unfortunate interpolation at the most crucial point of the anaphora of Basileios the Great does not excite us, but we return to mistakes corrected and demonstrably underlined by old and remarkable persons (Saint Nikodēmos, Patriarch Kōnstantios). Our old-time priests, who came to know the right practice from older printed editions, will be troubled with the new printed editions and will wonder how the parallel official approval of both forms can be reconciled. Before long, the new priests, by knowing and using only the new printed editions, will not be troubled even if the incorrect taxis will prevail and will be considered by all "sacred tradition." I have the opinion that the least that can be done is the immediate elimination of the addition before it is too late.

NOTE: On the topic of this troparion's correction, new questions repeatedly are arising. However, we will not go back, because we consider it exhausted for this column after what we wrote especially regarding it in the answer to question 417 and to other questions that are raised on related topics (numbers 225, 256, and 450). In any case, fortunately a question has never been generated regarding the restoration of the correct and original, "O Lord, save the kings,"[1143] instead of the corrected form, "O Lord, save the pious,"[1144] in the hierarchical Liturgy.

1142. "Σῶσον Κύριε τὸν λαὸν σου..."
1143. "Κύριε, σῶσον τοὺς βασιλεῖς."
1144. "Κύριε, σῶσον τοὺς εὐσεβεῖς."

## 482

**When the priest serves alone, does he say "Bless, master,"[1145] "Cover, master,"[1146] "Break, master,"[1147] and so forth of the deacon? Some say them since they are written in the service book[1148] or since they interpret them as being addressed to Christ the master. Others omit them. Which is correct? And if they must be omitted during the Liturgy in which the deacon does not participate, then why do they exist in the "Hieratikon" and create confusion? Most times, there is no concelebrating deacon.**

In the answers to questions 400 and 408, which are referring to the diaconal command, "And those whom each has in mind, and of all men and women,"[1149] we addressed this topic indirectly, to which the questions above refer. There, we quoted an "indisputably poorly written," as we characterized it, standard rubric that is repeated in various printed editions of the Hieratika, according to which the priest if he serves alone, says "all the things of the deacon" except "Bless master." Relying on this standard rubric, many priests say all the diaconal elements of the Divine Liturgy and of the proskomidē (except "Bless, master"), not because they understand that these things are addressed to themselves, but rather from a pious intention, so in order that they might have, in some manner, peace of mind. That they are addressing "Christ the master" when saying these exhortations is a completely mistaken "theological" interpretation, indicative of the attempt for some plausible coverage of the absurdity of the matter, which not even those invoking it believe. These diaconal commands are clear and without any possibility of another interpretation because they are addressed to the serving priest, and only to him. For this reason, also, some priests, who are thinking more logically, omit them, but are disturbed by the thought that they perhaps are doing something irregular, since they act in disregard of the pertinent clear standard rubric. A fruit of their concerns

1145. "Εὐλόγησον, δέσποτα."
1146. "Κάλυψον, δέσποτα."
1147. "Μέλισον, δέσποτα."
1148. "ἡ φυλλάδα."
1149. "Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν."

is indeed the very correct thought for there to be in the Hieratika only what is said by the priest in the most common cases when he serves alone. This would be not only practically helpful but would also constitute a serious step in the return to the correct tradition in the case in question, which prescribes the contents of the liturgical books by apportioning the liturgical material according to the roles of the persons who participate in the celebration of divine worship. The modern tendency to create a kind of compilation appears useful at first glance because it gives a comprehensive image of what is being performed, but at the same time it creates true chaos during the use of these texts at the time of the ceremony.

As is well known, the ancient manuscripts, even the first printed editions, were either "Hieratika" or "Diakonika." The present-day liturgical service books,[1150] even if they are entitled "Hieratika," are mixed texts, "Hieratika" and "Diakonika" together, indeed with tendencies in some of them of covering, at least in part, also the role of the people. The old "Hieratika" contained only the prayers that the priest said and prompts[1151] (the beginnings of the diaconal elements and of the responses of the people) as well as very brief standard rubrics. Conversely, the "Diakonika" only contained the things that are said by the deacon and, again in a prompting manner, the beginnings of the priestly exclamations and of the responses of the people, and most briefly also here standard rubrics, which pertained to the diaconal deontology. However, practical needs led to the merging of these two liturgical books. Namely, while the standard liturgical taxis made provision for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy always with the participation of a deacon, in practice the priests were compelled to celebrate it by themselves, a thing that slowly became the standard for reasons of difficult circumstances. And nowadays, in spite of the tangible improvement of circumstances, deacons are scarce and most Liturgies are celebrated without their participation. During the celebration of services, it would not be possible for the priests to use two liturgical books at the same time, insofar as they also took on the diaconal elements, but a single text, the "Hiera-

1150. "φυλλάδες."
1151. "ὑπομνηστικά."

tikon." However, the mixture of two separate roles in practice and in the texts next also came to invite quite a few corruptions in liturgical taxis, such as the omission of the diaconal elements or displacement of prayers. And even if a deacon concelebrated, diaconal practices were passed on by acquired habit to the priests, such as the censing during the Cherubic hymn and participation in the processional transfer of the precious gifts to the altar during the great entrance, acts originally purely diaconal. The role of the deacon in divine worship is assigned with much wisdom. He performs the function of master of ceremonies in two directions: towards the people and towards the priest. He does not pray to God (save for the exceptions: "Help...,"[1152] "Have mercy on us, O God...,"[1153] "Save, O God, your people..."[1154]); this is the work of the priest. Nevertheless, he places in the mouths of the people the entreaties of prayer (litanies, ektenēs, plērōtika, petitions, and so forth) and determines their posture during it ("Wisdom,"[1155] "Let us attend,"[1156] "Bending the knees..."[1157]). Moreover, he reminds the priest what he must do and even what he must say, addressing himself to him always with the utmost politeness and modesty, calling him "sir" ("master").[1158] His phrases are brief and are found in complete correspondence to what is said and done by the priest: "Bless"[1159]—"Blessed is our God..."[1160] or "Blessed is the Kingdom...,"[1161] "Lift up"[1162]—"For his life is lifted up...,"[1163] "Sacrifice"[1164]—"Sacrificed

1152. "Ἀντιλαβοῦ..."
1153. "Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, ὁ Θεός..."
1154. "Σῶσον ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαόν σου...
1155. "Σοφία."
1156. "Πρόσχωμεν."
1157. "Κλίναντες τὰ γόνατα..."
1158. "'κύριο' ('δέσποτα')."
1159. "Εὐλόγησον."
1160. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν..."
1161. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία..."
1162. "Ἔπαρον."
1163. "Ὅτι αἴρεται..."
1164. "Θῦσον."

is...,"[1165] "Pierce"[1166]—"...pierced...,"[1167] "Cover"[1168]—"Your virtue has covered...,"[1169] "Break"[1170]—"Broken is..."[1171] and similar things. Indeed, in some cases, the diaconal commands proved more long-lasting in liturgical development and remained more faithful to the older practice, such as "Establish"[1172] for the asteriskos ("By the Lord's word the heavens were established..."[1173] the ancient one — "And the star coming..."[1174] the modern) and "Do good"[1175] during the censing after the great entrance ("Do good to Sion, O Lord, in your good pleasure..."[1176] the ancient — "Then they will offer..."[1177] the modern).

And for us not to prolong the discussion. When the priest serves alone without a deacon, he is also responsible by necessity for part of the diaconal duties. Namely, he says and performs not only the priestly elements, but also the diaconal ones that pertain to prescribing the entreaties of the synaxis (litanies, petitions, plērōtika, ektenēs, synaptes, and so forth) as well as those things that prescribe the posture of the people during prayer ("Arise,"[1178] "Wisdom," "Let us attend," "Let us bow our heads to the Lord,"[1179] and so forth). He does not say the diaconal elements that are addressed to the priest, namely, to himself. This would be pointless and absurd. Namely, not only "Bless, master"[1180] at the beginning of the Divine Liturgy, but by extension also all the other things that are said during the proskomidē; dialogues before the enarxis of the Divine Liturgy, be-

1165. "Θύεται..."
1166. "Νῦξον."
1167. "...ἔνυξε..."
1168. "Κάλυψον."
1169. "Ἐκάλυψεν..."
1170. "Μέλισον."
1171. "Μελίζεται..."
1172. "Στερέωσον."
1173. "Τῷ λόγῳ Κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερέωθησαν..." (Ps 32:6).
1174. "Καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ ἀστήρ..."
1175. "Ἀγάθυνον..."
1176. "Ἀγάθυνον, Κύριε, ἐν τῇ εὐδοκίᾳ σου τὴν Σιών..."
1177. "Τότε ἀνοίσουσιν..."
1178. "Ὀρθοί."
1179. "Τὰς κεφαλὰς ἡμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ κλίνωμεν."
1180. "Εὐλόγησον, δέσποτα."

fore the reading the gospel and after the deposit of the precious gifts on the holy table; exhortations for blessing of the incense, the entrance, the throne, the precious gifts during the consecration, during the preparatory actions before communion and after it; and similar things. Most of these instances, which together with the verbose, according to the modern tendency, standard rubrics that accompany them, burden the text of our Hieratika without reason and cause, understandably, confusion and problems. Instead of making things easier, as it should be, for the priests that are compelled to serve by themselves, they make them more difficult. For this reason, also, I find very important the proposal for the creation of a special Hieratikon, which precisely addresses these practical and real conditions for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy by only the priest without a deacon, as daily liturgical practice requires.

In our age, this is not difficult. Printed editions of liturgical books are done frequently, and the possibilities of contemporary publishing technology are unlimitedly great. Consequently, the return to special "Diakonika" and to special "Hieratika" (as is done with the "Archieratika"), or even to mixed "Hieratika/Diakonika," for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy by only the priest would be desirable. Then, in these, there would not be a reason for the diaconal elements to be inserted, which are addressed to him, or which pertain only to diaconal participation. Or at least, in the case of the keeping to the newer mixed form, it would be very convenient and easy for the diaconal elements said in the Divine Liturgy when a deacon celebrates to be printed with letters of one type, and what things are not said when the priest serves by himself with another type. Thus, it would be possible for the confusions to be avoided, which are consequently invited by the uncritical and antitraditional blend of all these elements from the individual liturgical roles.

## 483

**Why do the canons of feasts of the Lord (such as Great Saturday, Pascha, Pentecost, Theophany) not have any theotokia in the odes?**

The canons, as is also characteristically denoted by their name, have been composed on the basis of a predetermined plan. Namely, during their composition, the hymnographers followed standards given in advance, one of which was that the last troparion of each ode praises the Panagia, namely, it is a theotokion. From the ninth century onwards, the authors of the canons follow this standard without exception. However, among the earlier hymnographers, only Andreas of Crete (d. 720) concludes all the odes of his canons with triadika and theotokia.[1181] On the other hand, the slightly later great hymnographers, Saint Iōannēs of Damascus (d. 756) and his contemporary and adopted brother Kosmas the Hymnographer, bishop of Maiuma,[1182] while aware of the use of the theotokia, yet rarely use them as conclusions for the odes of their canons. The canons for the feasts of the Lord are the works of both these composers.

Especially for feasts of the Lord, the omission of the theotokia could be interpreted as being due to the stature of dominical subjects. The same thing also occurs in the series of stichēra and of aposticha for these days, as well as also in the kathismata, which do not have, as is well known, theotokia. However, Kosmas also did not conclude odes for canons of saints with theotokia. Thus, the only correct interpretation appears to be that the omission of theotokia is due to the age of these canons. Namely, they date back to a period where the custom had not yet become commonly prevalent for odes of canons to be concluded with theotokia, namely, they are older than the ninth century, or even works of Kosmas the Hymnographer, where one of the characteristic traits of his work is the rare use of theotokia as a conclusion for the odes of the canons.

1181. The dates of Saint Andreas of Crete's life are usually listed as ca. 660–740.

1182. Saint Kosmas the Hymnographer (ca. 675–ca. 752).

## 484

**In the Roman Catholic Church, the celebrating clergy recite the "Our Father" and the congregation says the exclamation, "For yours is the kingdom ...."[1183] Did this taxis also formerly prevail in the Orthodox Church or is this an innovation of the West?**

Originally the Lord's Prayer was not said during the Divine Liturgy. For this reason, it is also not contained in the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which captures the liturgical practice of the Church of Antioch in Syria at the end of the fourth century. However, already from Saint Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258), we have the first, but somewhat obscure, witness who associates the Lord's Prayer with the mystery of the Divine Eucharist and communion (*Concerning the Lord's Prayer* 2). However, from the catechisms of Saint Kyrillos of Jerusalem (d. 386) and Saint Ambrose of Milan (d. 397) we know that at least in these regions the Lord's Prayer had already been introduced into the Divine Liturgy. This is verified a little later by Saint Augustine of Hippo (d. 430), who considers this practice as being in force throughout "nearly the entire Church" (*Epistle 149*).[1184] The reasons that contributed to the introduction of the "Our Father" into the Divine Liturgy were mainly the entreaty regarding providing daily bread to the faithful, which was interpreted with a eucharistic meaning (the reading also exists, "τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ὑπερούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον/give us today our supra-essential bread"), as well as also mutual forgiveness and reconciliation, which is a necessary presupposition for participation in holy communion.

The different manner according to region of its recitation as well as the variants that are observed regarding its position in the taxis of the Divine Liturgy are due to the later introduction of the Lord's Prayer into the liturgical texts of the various liturgical forms.

---

1183. Ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν..."

1184. "quod omnis uel paene omnis frequentat ecclesia," Al. Goldbacher, ed., *S. Aureli Augustini Operum Section II. S. Augustini Epistulae, Pars III Ep. CXXIV–CLXXXIV*, Corporus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, vol. XXXXIIII (Leipzig: G. Freytag, 1904) 362. 16–17; Wilfrid Parsons, trans., *Saint Augustine: Letters Volume III (131–164)*, The Fathers of the Church, A New Translation, vol. 20 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953), 250.

This latter point of variants according to region is characteristically more pronounced for the Symbol of Faith, which also itself was introduced later into the original text of the Liturgies locally. Thus, while in the East and in Milan the recitation took place before the prayer of the anaphora, in Rome and in Armenia it was done after the gospel reading and in Spain before communion. In other words, these differences are not the results of modernistic tendencies or innovations by one or the other church but are due to the post factum introduction of these sacred texts (here, the Lord's Prayer as well as the sacred Symbol) into already basically solidified liturgical forms. Each church acted according to its judgment or followed the example of other churches, when independently making its own choices, as certainly it had a right to do. For this era, the introduction of the Lord's Prayer or Symbol of Faith into the Divine Liturgy was an "innovation." Once this took place, the place of insertion and the manner of recitation were details.

Specifically, now, the "Our Father" in Rome, Milan, and Spain was probably considered as a conclusion of the canon (the prayer of the anaphora) of the Divine Liturgy. For this reason, also, it was associated more with the prayer of the anaphora, and this obviously is the reason that it was recited only by the celebrating priest, just as also the anaphora. The people in Spain said "Amen" at every entreaty of the Lord's Prayer, while in Rome the priest stopped the recitation at "lead us not into temptation" and people concluded with "but deliver us from evil. Amen." Perhaps this was a relic of an earlier practice or an influence from the East, according to which the entire "Our Father" was said by the people. Moreover, in the East, the "Our Father" was said by the people, or rather by the clergy and people together, while the priest exclaimed the doxological conclusion, "For yours is the kingdom...." Thus, the Lord's Prayer was associated more with holy communion, as a preparatory prayer for it, than with the prayer of the holy anaphora. Certainly, for this reason, in all the liturgical forms of the East, aside from the Byzantine, Armenian, and Maronite, the recitation of the Lord's Prayer took place after the fraction of the Holy Bread, a practice that was followed in certain regions of the West.

The Second Vatican Council (1961–1963), in its effort to reform sacred worship by emphasizing the participation of the people, which had slackened, and obviously imitating the practice of the East, introduced or brought back the collective recitation of the "Our Father" by clergy and people in the Divine Liturgy. "For yours is…" is chanted again by all after the end of the Lord's Prayer. We said that the recitation of the "Our Father" in the East historically took place by the clergy and people together. In theory, this is in force up until nowadays. We said, "in theory," because in practice other tendencies became prevalent. In monasteries and parishes, as is well known, the presider or a member of the choir says it, certainly on behalf of the people. The return to the ancient practice, undoubtedly more correct, is also assuredly desirable for us. It is unnecessary for us to say that what wrongly takes place during the Lord's Prayer does not contribute to this return, namely, the priest's reading of the prayer of inclination and the deacon's preoccupation with the crisscrossing of his orarion. The Lord's Prayer is and remains a central point for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, and the whole eucharistic community—clergy and people together—participate in its recitation.

## 485

**During the Vespers of Kneeling of Pentecost, does the entrance take place with the Gospel book, as in the Vespers for the Sunday of Pascha, or with censer?**

The Typikon wisely provides for "with censer"[1185] during the entrance of the Vespers for Pentecost, but "with the Gospel book"[1186] during the Vesperal entrance for the Sunday of Pascha.[1187] The reason is obvious: During the Vespers of Pentecost, a gospel reading is not about to be read; conversely during the Vespers of Pascha, the pericope of the appearance of the Risen One to the apostles is read, which took place precisely during the evening of that Sunday, "on the evening of that day on the first day of the week" (John 20:19–25).

1185. "μετὰ θυμιατοῦ."

1186. "μετὰ τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου."

1187. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 391, 372.

The entrance of Vespers, corresponds with the so-called "small entrance" of the Divine Liturgy and at many points similar with it, serves a wisely limited practical purpose, which by reason of the development of the liturgical practice in the meantime, is not so apparent nowadays. The sacred Nikolaos Kabasilas verifies what applies regarding it, as well as for the small entrance of the Divine Liturgy. Namely, "it takes place…because of the need presented…such as the bringing of the Gospel book into the altar" (*On the Divine Liturgy* 16.6).[1188] In the common Vespers without a gospel reading, this "need"[1189] arises in the offering of incense in the altar, to which there also exists a clear allusion in the prayer of the entrance ("direct our prayer as incense before you").[1190] For those Vespers during which a gospel reading is provided for (Great Friday, Pascha, the eves of the Nativity and Theophany when the feast falls on a Sunday or Monday), the entrance takes place, "with the Gospel book." For precisely the same reason, this latter point also applies to those Vespers that are combined with the Divine Liturgy, where the entrance of Vespers is identified with the small entrance of the Divine Liturgy, since a gospel reading is about to be read (Great Thursday, Great Saturday, the eves of the Nativity and Theophany). By extension, the same thing also applies regarding the Presanctified, during the entrance of which if a reading of a gospel pericope is provided for, this takes place "with the Gospel book" (commemorations of the saints, first three days of Great Week) or only "with censer" during the remaining and more regular ones. The reading of the pericopes from the Old or the New Testament during Vespers (feasts, commemorations of celebrated saints, commemorations of apostles, Vespers of Great Lent) do not affect the entrance because the liturgical tradition does not know "an entrance with the Holy Scriptures"—Old Testament or Apostolos—as has been introduced into the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos through a misunderstanding of the pertinent rubrics. The entrance in the Divine Liturgy or in Vespers always and

1188. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 16.6 (SC 4bis:130–131).

1189. "χρεία."

1190. "κατεύθυνον τὴν προσευχὴν ἡμῶν ὡς θυμίαμα ἐνώπιον σου."

only takes place "with the Gospel book" or "with [the] censer,"[1191] as "need" imposes it. Let us incidentally note that the "asmatic" liturgical taxis also knew an entrance "without lamps and censer"[1192]—naturally also "without the Gospel book"[1193]—during the service of the "Trithektē" or "Tritoektē," but never an entrance with another liturgical book apart from the Gospel book (in the "Trithektē," pericopes were read from Isaiah and Ezekiel).[1194]

Specifically, regarding the Vespers of the Kneeling of Pentecost, I personally saw the same thing take place, the entrance with the Gospel book, contrary to the clear rubric of the Typikon. If we judge from the question, it appears that the latter instance was not isolated. The priests justified it because "they received it this way." Obviously, this is an imitation of the practice for the Vespers of Pascha or an influence of the prokeimenon, "Who is so great a God...,"[1195] which in both these cases is chanted, or the fact that the prayers of kneeling were considered as something parallel to the gospel reading or finally, in order to give a greater solemnity to the entrance. Not least, I also not cite a recent experience, namely, the entrance during the Vespers of the Annunciation, which fell at the same time with the service of Akathist (1989), again with the Gospel book, likely, for the same reasons. Certainly, this practice has its source in ignorance or misunderstanding of the pertinent rubrics of the Typikon, but in any case, with an incorrect appreciation of the practical liturgical purpose of the entrance. The entrance, even in its present-day form, is not "an entrance of the Gospel book" or, by analogy, "an entrance of the censer," but an entrance of the priest (or of the celebrants) into the altar (compare also "grant with our entrance"[1196] of the entrance prayer for the Liturgy). An entrance takes place in order for

1191. "μετά (τοῦ) θυμιατοῦ."

1192. "ἄνευ φώτων καὶ θυμιατοῦ."

1193. "ανευ τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου."

1194. Also known as the "τριτοέκτη," for studies of the Trithektē, see: M. Arranz, "Les prières presbytérales de la Tritoekti de l'ancien Euchologe byzantin," *OCP* 43 (1977): 70–93, 335–354; Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Ἀκολουθίαι τοῦ Νυχθημέρου*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 1' (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 11–44.

1195. "Τίς Θεός..."

1196. "ποίησον σὺν τῇ εἰσόδῳ ἡμῶν."

the Gospel book to be read or in order for incense to be offered, as appropriate. Liturgical development (the priest is already found in the altar even before the entrance, the Gospel book is placed permanently on the altar, the coexistence of the skeuophylakion and the holy bēma) and varied symbolisms (entrance of the Christ into the world, and so forth) somehow overshadowed the "according to need"[1197] of the entrance and transformed it into a type of procession. Nevertheless, the liturgical purpose, as we saw, is hidden in the standard rubrics, which come from this original tradition and taxis.

In light of this, let us note that there is a problem in the entrances of Vespers "with the Gospel book" of whether the offering of incense is completely proscribed; namely, whether the entrance ought to take place "with the Gospel book" and "with censer" at the same time. This is because in instances of an entrance "with the Gospel book," the prayer, "In the evening and in the morning and at noonday...,"[1198] remains as the prayer of the entrance with the already clear allusion referring to the offering of incense. I saw this mixed form of the entrance observed in the present-day practice in Greek rite[1199] communities of the East, which probably preserve some pertinent ancient tradition. Obviously, this fell into disuse for practical reasons, since two deacons would have to participate in the entrance, something quite rare. But perhaps it also originated from the tendency for the prominence of the Gospel book, the entrance of which overweighed the entrance with the censer. At least, this can be thus gathered from the transitional rubrics of the Typikon of Saint Sophia in Constantinople from the ninth century (*Codices Timiou Staurou 40* and *Patmos 266*). According to this Typikon, during the Vespers of Great Friday, the entrance took place "with the megaleion[1200] [namely, the Gospel book], without a censer and candlesticks"[1201] obviously because of the mourning nature of the service. Conversely, during the Vespers of Great Saturday, namely,

1197. "κατὰ τὴν χρείαν."

1198. "Ἑσπέρας καὶ πρωῒ καὶ μεσημβρίας..."

1199. "ἑλληνόρρυθμες."

1200. The word "τὸ μεγαλεῖον" can be translated here as the "book containing the gospels."

1201. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:80.

the all-night vigil of Pascha, the entrance takes place "with the megaleion…the large censer and three candles."[1202] In all the instances above, the Typikon of the Monastery of Evergetis (twelfth century) speaks concerning an entrance "with the megaleion, namely, the Gospel book,"[1203] without any mention of the censer. This is gradually solidified and is clearly specified by the modern Typika: "An entrance with the Gospel book, without censer."[1204]

## 486

**Is it permitted for the Exaltation of the Precious Cross on September 14 and its veneration on the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross to take place after the Divine Liturgy in order for all the faithful to be present and for the related disorder during the kissing of the cross and the distribution of flowers to be avoided?**

Normally, the Exaltation of the Precious Cross and taxis for the Veneration of the Cross on the Sunday by the same name take place at the end of Matins and, consecutively to it, after the last trisagion ("perissē")[1205] of the doxology. This is precisely provided for by all the Typika, old and new, for the two cases above, as well as also on the Procession of the Precious Cross on August 1st. The same taxis is also prescribed by the ancient "asmatic" parish Typika, of Saint Sophia in Constantinople from the ninth century (codices of *Patmos 266* and *Timiou Staurou 40*) and by the Typikon of Saint Sophia of Thessaloniki before and after the reform of Saint Symeōn, archbishop of Thessaloniki. The reason is apparent, the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, or its procession during the other two cases in order that it be

1202. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:84.

1203. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 494–495, 500–501

1204. "Εἴσοδος μετὰ τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου, ἄνευ θυμιατοῦ."

1205. Perissē (περισσή), the double final repetition of the entire troparion; sometimes the term refers to a second refrain substituted at the end of the antiphon for the final repetition of the troparion, see Robert F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Vol. II, The Great Entrance: A History of the Transfer of Gifts and Other Preanaphoral Rites*, OCA 200, 4th ed. (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2004), 88.

exposed for veneration, constitute the pinnacle of the day's service and after it the Typika make provision for an ektenēs, a final dismissal, and a break in the service, as even nowadays also takes places on the Holy Mountain, on Patmos, in monasteries that observe the strict ancient taxis, and in the Slavic churches. Consequently, the disruption of the taxis due to the movement of the faithful for the veneration of the precious cross was not, for the era of the compilation of the Typika, a sufficient reason for a possible consideration of the transfer of the taxis for the Exaltation or for the Veneration of the Cross after the Divine Liturgy. Moreover, the Divine Liturgy shifts the weight of the theological meaning of the synaxis to the summation of the Lord's redemptive work, to the eternal Pascha of the Church. The subjects of the feasts are nearly exhausted with the end of the service of Matins. But also, beyond that, particularly in the service of the Exaltation, the priest's deep prostrations to the ground after holy communion would not be practically advisable, as well as the kissing of the cross for all after partaking of the Holy Elements.

These things for the justification and safeguarding of the taxis provided for by the Typikon, as has become apparent, were not prescribed randomly, but on the basis of liturgical, theological, and even practical reasons. It is likewise self-evident that modifications to the Typikon must not be generally encouraged, both for the preservation of the relative unity of worship and for the avoidance of self-initiated actions, abuses, and possible errors.

Nonetheless, the reasons raised for the transfer of the rite of the Exaltation and the Veneration of the Cross after the Divine Liturgy are not negligible, and I know instances where it is tacitly done by priests. Naturally we are not speaking regarding the practice of monasteries, but of parishes. In these, the Divine Liturgy is celebrated consecutively with Matins, and, certainly due to the movements of the majority of the faithful, a fair amount of disorder and delay is created due to the veneration of the cross. For this reason, many celebrate the Exaltation or leave the procession of the cross in its place but permit the kissing of the cross and the distribution of the flowers to take place after the dismissal, certainly also itself a

disorderly thing liturgically. Likewise, it is an unquestionable fact that if the Exaltation or the Veneration of the Cross takes place according to the precise taxis at the end of Matins, a large part, if not the majority, of the people are absent from the synaxis for justifiable or unjustifiable reasons. This was always seriously taken into the consideration by ecclesiastical practice, as is apparent from quite a few instances of transfers of similar elements beloved by the people from our services. For this reason, the eōthinon gospel was transferred between the eighth and ninth odes of Sunday Matins, the lamentations of the Matins for Great Saturday after the canon, the procession of the icons on the Sunday of Orthodoxy after the Divine Liturgy, and certainly the service of the Great Hagiasmos of Theophany on the day of the feast from the end of Matins to the end of the Divine Liturgy. All these transfers, which began informally and locally, were formalized by later Typika. Some of them certainly became prevalent not only in the parishes, but even in the monasteries, where the specific reasons that influence the practice of the churches in the world were not encountered. The same thing also occurs with the sermon, which is customary for the same reasons to be transferred to the place of the koinōnikon, despite the unacceptability of the matter from many points of view.

Despite all the preceding, I have the impression that for the two significant practical reasons that I mentioned previously (movements for the Exaltation, kissing of the cross), at least regarding the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, the transfer of the Exaltation after the Divine Liturgy would not be advisable. Regarding the Veneration of the Cross and the Procession, this could be discussed, always with the serious reservation that strictness is more preferable than individual initiatives. Moreover, experience acquired in the meantime showed that the transfer of the eōthinon gospel and the lamentations confused parish practice, without also bringing many benefits.

## 487

**The end of the funeral prayer, "Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκός..." (O God of spirits and of all flesh...) appears to be different by one word in various printed editions: "ὁ λόγος σου ἀλήθεια" (your word is truth) or "ὁ νόμος σου ἀλήθεια" (your law is truth). Which is the more correct reading, "λόγος" (word) or "νόμος" (law)?**

This marvelous and most ancient prayer also presents another critical problem, concerning which we also have a pertinent question, and, with God's help, we shall return to. It refers to its initial phrase, "ὁ τὸν θάνατον καταπατήσας, τὸν δὲ διάβολον καταργήσας" (who trampled upon death, abolishing the power of the devil), which is encountered inversely, "ὁ τὸν διάβολον καταπατήσας, τὸν δὲ θάνατον καταργήσας" (who trampled upon the devil, abolishing the power of death), in manuscripts, printed editions, and in practice. A first attempt at dealing with this critical problem showed that it is quite complex and for this reason we left it for a more suitable time.[1206] Conversely, the likewise critical problem of the final phrase, which is posed by the present question, "λόγος" (word) or "νόμος" (law), is simpler, but not as much as it appears at first glance.

In the first place, the overwhelming majority of printed Euchologia, Hieratika, Hagiasmataria, or independent publications, in which the prayer is encountered, have the term, "λόγος" (word), and very few have the word, "νόμος" (law). Certainly, the pursuit of the correct reading is not a matter of a majority number, but in any case, this is indicative of the preference for a tradition on a disputed point of our sacred liturgical texts. Nor is it possible—and perhaps not worthwhile—for anyone to look at the dozens of editions that exist of our liturgical books. The following of those I could see have "λόγος" (word): Euchologia—Goar 1730, Venice 1760, 1832, Rome 1873. Hieratika—Venice 1795, 1881, Athens 1881, 1892, Constantinople 1875, Apostolikē Diakonia 1950, 1951, 1968, Rome 1950, Athens (S. Poulēs) unknown date. Hagiasmataria or Small Euchologia—Venice 1868, 1899, Athens (Ankyras) unknown

1206. See question 563.

date, Phoinix 1928, Saliveros–Talantios unknown date, Apostolikē Diakonia 1956, Rome 1955. Independent publications of memorial services—Mount Athos 1889, 1935. Contrariwise, the following of those I could see have "νόμος" (law): Euchologia—Venice 1862 and Athens (Saliveros–Papadopoulos) 1927. Hieratika—Athens (Saliveros–Papadopoulos) unknown date, and Apostolikē Diakonia 1962, 1977. Hagiasmataria—Venice 1869 and Apostolikē Diakonia 1972 (and its independent reprintings).

The retrospection into the manuscripts was clearly in favor of the reading, "λόγος" (word), without this excluding that another reading, "νόμος" (law), could also exist within a large number of manuscripts that contain such a useful prayer. In any case, all the manuscripts that I saw had "καὶ ὁ λόγος σου ἀλήθεια" (and your word is truth) including the most ancient Euchologion, the *Codex Barberini 336* from the eighth-ninth centuries, which is also the first witness of our Byzantine liturgical tradition.[1207] Ancient Slavonic and Arabic translations also have the reading, "word."

But also, Symeōn of Thessaloniki, in his commentary on the funeral service, when interpreting the prayer in question, has in mind the reading "λόγος" (word), and not "νόμος" (law), where he also not only uses it as a link between the prayer and exclamation, but even of the entire dependency of the funeral service on Psalm 118, the "amōmos": "And because He is righteous and His word is truth, and because He is also truth and has said: 'I am the Resurrection and life.'[1208] Therefore, the priest exclaiming this says to God, 'For You are the Resurrection…,' for we hope that the one lying buried shall live, arise, and find repose in the Lord. Therefore, this takes place also in the three staseis of the amōmos of the Psalms" (*Dialogue*, chapter 366).[1209] Indeed, according to Saint Symeōn's wonderful correct observation, this phrase of the prayer is dependent semantically on the passage, John 17:17, "ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστι" (your word is truth)

1207. Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Euchologio Barberini Gr. 336*, Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 264.2.

1208. John 11:25.

1209. PG 155:684d–685a.

and is expressed in the exclamation, "Ὅτι σύ εἶ ἡ ἀνάστασις, ἡ ζωή..." (For you are the Resurrection and life..."), which is also dependent on the word of the Lord to Martha, "ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή" (I am the Resurrection and the life) (John 11:25). Otherwise, the exclamation, namely, the conclusion of the prayer, remains in limbo and unrelated to the content and especially to the second part of the prayer, which speaks regarding remission of sins and not resurrection. Thus, the "λόγος" (word) of the Lord concerning resurrection and life opens the optimistic outlook with which this masterfully written prayer is concluded. The "λόγος" (word) is the hope and the joy of the faithful and the guarantee of our life and repose after death. The reminder of the "νόμος" (law) would be inopportune, if not even in some manner negative, since "by works of law all flesh will not be justified before" God, according to the Apostle (Rom 3:20, Gal 2:26). In any case, the phrase "ἡ δικαιοσύνη σου δικαιοσύνη εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ὁ νόμος σου ἀλήθεια" (your righteousness is righteousness for the ages and your law is truth) is a verbatim quotation of the 142nd verse of the amōmos psalm, which historically was an element of the funeral service and very deeply influenced, as we have already said, its structure and contents, so much that, in liturgical terminology, funeral or memorial service and "amōmos" or "amōmoi" are synonymous words. According to the syntax of the prayers, its unknown most accomplished author either attempted when changing the word "νόμος" (law) with "λόγος" (word), to achieve that which as we saw he excellently achieved by associating the psalmic verse with the passage of John 17:17 and by linking it with John 11:25 (the exclamation), or had in mind a manuscript of the Psalms, which has the reading "λόγος" (word) for the contested phrase instead of this one where "νόμος" (law) prevailed, which later also caused the correction by its appeal. Indeed, old manuscripts of the Old Testament are preserved which have for Psalm 118:142b "καὶ ὁ λόγος σου ἀλήθεια" (your word is truth), a reading, which in the text at least of our prayer, as it appeared from what we said, is the original, the most correct, and anyway, the more preferable one.

Speaking of the prayer, "Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκός..." (O God of spirits and of all flesh...), and all that we

have said about it, let me be permitted to take this opportunity to note that in recent times it is customary for this unparalleled and ancient text—which constitutes one of the most marvelous texts of our euchology literature (in some manuscripts it is attributed to Basileios the Great), and with which generations after generations of pious and Orthodox Christians have been sent on their way—to be wrongly replaced with other verbose later prayers that are concerned with both lifting anathemas and the decay[1210] of the bodies of our brothers and sisters "fallen asleep," and are not even funereal, but rather are memorial prayers asking for forgiveness.[1211]

## 488

**In the prokeimena for the Sunday epistle reading from the twenty-ninth Sunday up until the Fifth Sunday of the Fast, an apparent irregularity is presented, which is highlighted by the footnotes that exist in the Apostolos. Ultimately, which prokeimenon will be said, that of the Sunday or of the tone? The same thing applies also for the eōthina and for the allēlouaria. Which is correct?**

In the specially edited publication of the Apostolos by the Apostolikē Diakonia of the Church of Greece, Athens 1979, p. 275, precisely on the twenty-ninth Sunday, from which the irregularity begins, a very accurate note has been placed, which essentially gives the answer to the very justified questions above. We quote it: "In the Typikon of the Monastery of Saint Sabbas and in chapter ninety-eight (98) of the difficulties of the Typikon,[1212] the prokeimena allēlouaria of

1210. "λύση." Although more properly translated as "dissolution" in its patristic sense when referring to the world, the word here is referring to buried corpses.

1211. See question 59.

1212. This is a section of the Typikon of Saint Sabas that deals with problems and questions associated with application of the Typikon, entitled "Σύνταγμα πονηθὲν εἰς τὰ ἀπορρούμενα τοῦ Τυπικοῦ" (Collection prepared for difficulties of the Typikon). See Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012), 389–482.

the eight tones, which are chanted on Sundays, are prescribed. For convenience, these were added to the printed editions of the Apostolos, respectively before and after the epistle pericope. Except, as a consequence, this juxtaposition had this misstep: on the two Sundays before the Nativity, as well on the Sundays after the feast of Lights and on those of the Triōdion, the tones are not the same every year, on account of the earliness or lateness of Pascha. For which reason, on these Sundays, it happens that a different prokeimenon and allēlouarion are said than that of the tone of the week.[1213] To avoid this misstep, prokeimena and the allēlouaria of the eight tones were added at the beginning of the Apostolos. In this manner, when this disorder is created from the twenty-ninth Sunday onwards, the reader can easily find there the prokeimenon and allelouarion for the tone of the week."[1214]

Indeed, that is where the "misstep"[1215] comes from, and thus the "disorder"[1216] is cured, which was caused by the thoughtless meddling, certainly from good intentions, of some earlier editor of the Apostolos, who, wishing to make things easier for the reader, introduced this inappropriate arrangement. However, this does not justify the perpetuation of that editing error, especially after its recognition. Provided the revision is properly done in order that new disorders and missteps are not created.

In the first place, the book of the Apostolos is a book of the reader. Apart from of course the epistle readings, the prokeimena, and the allēlouaria, there is justification for both the antiphons

---

1213. In other words, after the twenty-eighth week, the Apostolos contains the wrong prokeimena and allēlouaria as well as the wrong associated tone. In order to find the correct prokeimena and allēlouaria, one must know the correct "tone of the week" and refer to the listing at the beginning of the Apostolos.

1214. *Ἀπόστολος, Πράξεις καὶ Ἐπιστόλαι τῶν Ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων, Καθ' ὅλον τὸ ἔτος ἐπ' ἐκκλησίαις ἀναγινωσκόμεναι* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 1979), 274. The listing of the prokeimena and allēlouaria referenced occurs on pages 13–15. At the start of the listing, a reference is made to chapter 98 of the Typikon of Saint Sabas even though a comparison reveals slight differences for several tones.

1215. "ἀτόπημα."

1216. "ἀταξία."

and the koinōnika to exist in it, according to oikonomia in some manner, given that they are chanted by the choir and that the reader is a member of the choir in some sense. However, the placement of the indication of the eōthinon before the Sunday epistles is completely inappropriate. And up until the twenty-eighth Sunday, where the cycle of Sundays is regular, let us say that it is bearable. However, from there onwards, it was to be expected that the denoting of the eōthinon would cause the first error. The sequence of eōthina goes along normally but the epistle pericopes were not bound by this sequence until the Fifth Sunday of the Fast,[1217] as they were not also previously bound, but in any case, went along together independently.[1218]

Secondly. The prokeimena and allēlouaria do not have any connection with the pericopes. They follow the cycle of the eight tones according to their well-known and continually recurring sequence. Given that these are set, very correctly, at the beginning, not only is their repetition unnecessary on each Sunday, but this also becomes a cause for a new complication when a reading for a Sunday epistle is provided by the Mēnologion (and this occurs quite frequently), with the reader's consequent mistakes due to inexperience. Certainly, we all are witnesses of instances where the Sunday prokeimenon is read instead of the prokeimenon of the Mēnologion. From the twenty-ninth Sunday, the misalignment of the eōthina is repeated.[1219] The tones follow one sequence and the epistle pericopes another.[1220] By the same reasoning, both the prokeimena and allēlouaria of the weekdays (Monday, Tuesday, and so forth) also ought to be repeated every day, a thing that would cause an insufferable repetition, but

1217. Up to and including the Fifth Sunday of the Fast, which is followed by Palm Sunday, on which Matins has a festal reading and not one of the eleven eōthina.

1218. In other words, the sequence of epistle readings of Liturgy is independent of the eōthina of Matins.

1219. This misalignment occurs in the Apostolos, where the eōthina and tone are incorrectly recorded.

1220. Consequently, the wrong prokeimena and allēlouaria are provided in the Apostolos for the pericopes because they are based on the wrong tone.

would at least not lead to the misalignment of the Sunday prokeimena after the twenty-ninth Sunday.[1221]

The same misalignment would also happen to the allēlouaria from the twenty-ninth Sunday onwards, if the practice, certainly bad, did not place them into disuse, despite their particular practical and theoretical importance.

The possible, or rather imperative, removal of the prokeimena and the allēlouaria from the Sunday pericopes in a revision of the correct content for the book of the epistle pericopes, if not done correctly, we said could cause new errors. And this is because certain Sundays have their own prokeimena and allēlouaria, which relate to the subject of the feast that is invariably celebrated on them. In that case, the prokeimenon and the allēlouarion are not dependent on the tone of the week, but on the subject of the feast, on the basis of which the epistle pericope is also selected. Thus, the Sundays of Pascha, that of the Antipascha, that of the Holy 318 Fathers, that of Pentecost, that of All Saints and Palm Sunday, both Sundays of the Holy Fathers from the Mēnologion (July and October), the Sunday before the Exaltation and of the Holy Forefathers, the Sundays before and after the Nativity of Christ, and the Sundays before and after the feast of Lights, have their own prokeimena and allēlouaria, which must be accordingly inserted before and after the pericope.

However, the period of the Triōdion has its particular problems. As it appears from the very old rubric that is preserved in the Typikon of the Great Church from the ninth century (*Codices Patmos 266* and *Timiou Staurou 40*), the Sundays of the Triōdion in relation to the prokeimena and allēlouaria followed the sequence of the occurring tones, except for the Sunday of Meatfare, that of Cheesefare, and the First and Second Sundays, which had their own

1221. In other words, based on the logic that the same prokeimenon and the allēlouarion are associated with a specific tone, they would be repeated every single weekday in that tone (including on the Sunday of the same tone). However, the specification of the tone would have to be correct to begin with. Phountoulēs does not appear to be proposing this insertion of these weekday prokeimena and allēlouaria as a solution but is pointing out the problem of not providing a solution to reconciling two cycles that are independent of one another.

prokeimena and allēlouaria, unrelated to the tone of the week. This was not done arbitrarily and unconnected to the norms that govern the whole system of readings and of the elements that accompany them. Namely, the four pericopes of these Sundays did not follow the system of selections from the sequence, but the system of the Mēnologion. Namely, selected pericopes, and consequently their prokeimena and allēlouaria were not consistent with the tone of the week, but with the content of the reading, as far as this was possible. Thus, the pericope of the Sunday of Meatfare, which has fasting as a theme (1 Cor 8:8–13, 9:1–2), had verses 5 and 1 from Psalm 146 as a prokeimenon ("Great is our Lord and great is his strength. Praise the Lord because a melody is a good thing")[1222] in the third tone and Psalm 49:2–3 ("God will come conspicuously…a fire")[1223] as an allēlouarion in the first tone.[1224] The Sunday of Cheesefare with fasting again the theme (Rom 13:11–13:4) had a prokeimenon in plagal of the fourth tone, "Make your vows and pay to the Lord your God. God is known in Judea; in Israel his name is great"[1225] (Psalm 75:12, 2), and an allēlouarion of the same tone, "Of mercy and of justice…to me. I would walk…I hated"[1226] (Psalm 100:1–2, 2–3).[1227] The First Sunday of the Fast, at the time "commemoration…of the holy prophets," had an epistle for the prophets (Heb 11:24–26, 32–40) and a prokeimenon and allēlouarion similarly prophetic, "The devout will boast in glory…Sing to the Lord a new song"[1228] (Psalm 149:5, 1) in the grave tone and "Moses and Aaron…his name"[1229] (Psalm 98:6) in the fourth tone.[1230] Finally, on the Second Sunday of the Fast, on which the "commemoration…of the contest of our father among the saints Polycarp of Smyrna" was at the time celebrated

1222. "Μέγας ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν, καὶ μεγάλη ἡ ἰσχὺς αὐτοῦ. Αἰνεῖτε τὸν Κύριον, ὅτι ἀγαθὸς ψαλμός." Translation from NETS.

1223. "Ὁ Θεὸς ἐμφανῶς ἥξει…σφόδρα." Translation from NETS.

1224. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:2–3.

1225. "Εὔξασθε καὶ ἀπόδοτε Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν. Γνωστὸς ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ὁ Θεός, ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ μέγα τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ."

1226. "Ἔλεον καὶ κρίσιν…πρός με. Διεπορευόμην…ἐμίσησα."

1227. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:10–11.

1228. "Καυχήσονται ὅσιοι ἐν δόξῃ…Ἄσατε τῷ Κυρίῳ ἆσμα καινόν."

1229. "Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἀαρών…τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ."

1230. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:20–23.

in Saint Sophia by transfer from February 23, the prokeimenon in the grave tone, "One who is righteous will be glad"—"Listen to my voice, O God...to you"[1231] (Psalm 63:2) and the allēlouarion of the fourth tone, "A righteous one will flourish like a palm"[1232] (Psalm 91:13), was of the hieromartyr.[1233] As we said, those of the other Sundays were of the sequence of tones, for this reason also, since they could not be predicted, they could not be denoted on the Sundays.

Later other subjects were also introduced for the Sundays of Lent: the restoration of the holy icons for the First Sunday of Lent, the Veneration of the Cross for the Third, Blessed Iōannēs of the Ladder for the Fourth, Blessed Maria of Egypt for the Fifth, and finally, Saint Grēgorios Palamas for the Second Sunday of the Fast. However, the prokeimena and allēlouaria, (as well as the epistle readings) due to liturgical inflexibility, remained the same, namely, "or rather, the ordinary ones of the tone,"[1234] even also for the Second Sunday given that the transfer of the commemoration of Saint Polycarp to it was purely local and related only to the practice that became prevalent "in the holy Great Church." Thus, as we can confirm from the various old Typika, the three Sundays which also had selected pericopes (for Meatfare, Cheesefare, and the First Sunday of the Fast), alone had special prokeimena, with insignificant variations in the selection of the tone and the verse of the allēlouarion.

In the Typikon of Saint Sabas and in the Triōdion, which, as is well known, generally follows the the Sabaitic tradition, a tendency is observed for stabilization of the tones of the prokeimena

---

1231. "Εὐφρανθήσεται δίκαιος"— "Εἰσάκουσον, ὁ Θεός...πρὸς σέ."

1232. "Δίκαιος ὡς φοῖνιξ ἀνθήσει."

1233. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:30–31.

1234. "τὰ ἄμνημα ἤγουν τοῦ ἤχου." These are the resurrectional prokeimena and allēlouaria for Liturgies on Sundays which are "ordinary" namely, "on which a feast does not fall," *Ἀπόστολος, Πράξεις καὶ Ἐπιστόλαι τῶν Ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων, Καθ' ὅλον τὸ ἔτος ἐπ' ἐκκλησίαις ἀναγινωσκομέναι (Ἀθῆναι: Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, 1979), 13. These prokeimena and allēlouaria are listed at the beginning of the 1979 edition of the Apostolos on pages 13–15, which differ slightly from those listed in chapter 98 of the Typikon of Saint Sabas. For a discussion of their use, see Εὐάγγελος Αντωνιάδης, "Περὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἡμῶν ἀκολουθίαις Προκειμένων καὶ Ἀλληλουαρίων," *Δελτίον Χριστιανικῆς Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας* 2 (1933): 52.

and allēlouaria for the Sundays of the Triōdion obviously based on the Fifth Sunday of the Fast. The plagal of the fourth tone is assigned to it and the rest retroactively in reverse order, such that the plagal of the fourth tone is repeated on the Sunday of the Pharisee and Publican. The prokeimena and the allēlouaria are the well-known ones of Sunday, the "resurrectional ones"[1235] as they are characterized in the manuscripts, with the exception of the Sundays of Meatfare and Cheesefare, where the special old prokeimena and allēlouaria are preserved that we encountered in the Typikon of Saint Sophia. Thus, except for two instances, the series of tones according to the cycle of the Sundays is preserved, Plagal of the Fourth Tone (Publican and Pharisee), First Tone (Prodigal Son), the particular ones (of Meatfare and Cheesefare), Fourth Tone (First Sunday of the Fast), Plagal of the First Tone (Second Sunday of the Fast), Plagal of the Second Tone (Third Sunday of the Fast), Grave Tone (Fourth Sunday of the Fast), and Plagal of the Fourth Tone (Fifth Sunday of the Fast).[1236] The fact that this is deliberate and designed is apparent from the change of the prokeimenon for the First Sunday, where the subject of the day (the prophets) is preserved, but the prokeimenon and the allēlouarion of the fourth tone is chosen from the hymn of the Three Youths (Daniel 3:26, 27), "Blessed are you, O Lord, the God of our Fathers...For you are just in all..."[1237] and Psalm 98:6, "Moses and Aaron were among his priests,"[1238] respectively, of the Sunday of the Holy Forefathers, but where their chanting is provided for in the plagal of the fourth tone. Whether this took place only in order that the practice is facilitated especially for the prokeimena/allēlouaria alone or if it is the remains of a more general effort for simplification of the services and of the standard rubrics of Great Lent by the stabilization of the cycle of tones during it, where its traces are found in some manuscripts, this cannot be said with certainty. It is still in need of much study.

1235. "ἀναστάσιμα."

1236. The special prokeimena and allēlouaria for Meatfare and Cheesefare displace those in the second and third tones for this sequence.

1237. "Εὐλογητὸς εἶ, Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν...Ὅτι δίκαιος εἶ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν..."

1238. "Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἀαρὼν ἐν τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν αὐτοῦ."

Then comes a wrong step, which was made in the printed editions of the Apostoloi. While the attempt for preserving the sequence of tones during the prokeimena and allēlouaria was observed, yet it was mistakenly completed by the changing of the special traditional prokeimena and allēlouaria for the Sundays of Meatfare and Cheesefare (which had, as we saw, been preserved in old manuscripts and in the Triōdion) with the respective ones of the second and third tones for Sundays.[1239] In a new edition of the Apostolos, a revision must be correctly done, either for the sequence of the tones and their denoting according to the modern Typika to be maintained, or for consistency with the more ancient practice to be preferred, which is in force even nowadays in respect to the cycle of tones also during the period of the Triōdion.

## 489

### Is the celebration of memorial services permitted on September 14, the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross?

Memorial services are not celebrated on the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross due to the stature of the feast of the Lord, "bearing elements equal of holy and Great Friday."[1240]

We will discuss the remaining feasts of the Lord in a specific answer. However, the reason of equality to Great Friday is especially sufficient, namely, that of exclusive dedication to the commemoration of the Cross—namely, of the Passions on the Cross—of the Lord. On Great Friday, indisputably, memorials for those who have "fallen asleep" are not celebrated, and neither also by analogy on the Exaltation. Let us note that the commemoration of the great Father of the Church Iōannēs Chrysostomos (this also in a way a memorial service), who "fell asleep" on September 14 of the year 407, could not survive either, but his commemoration was transferred "on account of the feast of the Precious Cross"[1241] to November 13 "since it was

1239. *Ἀπόστολος, Πράξεις καὶ Ἐπιστολαὶ τῶν Ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων, Καθ' ὅλον τὸ ἔτος ἐπ' ἐκκλησίαις ἀναγινωσκόμεναι* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 1979), 325, 333.

1240. "φερούσης τὰ ἴσα τῆς ἁγίας καὶ μεγάλης Παρασκευῆς."

1241. "διὰ τὴν ἑορτὴν τοῦ τιμίου Σταυροῦ."

not possible to be celebrated at the same time as the Exaltation,"[1242] according to the synaxarion. If this applied to the commemoration of the sacred Chrysostomos, much more must it apply to memorial services—with or without kolyba is beside the point—for our Christian parents, brothers, and sisters who have "fallen asleep."

On this feast, the funeral service and Trisagia are certainly read at the graves of the dead. Names of those who have "fallen asleep" are similarly commemorated in the ektenēs, proskomidē, and in the the diptychs of the Divine Liturgy both on this day as well as throughout all days of the year, even on the very Sunday of Pascha. However, this cannot be adduced in any manner as an argument in favor of the celebration of memorial services during the festal synaxis of the Church on the day of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, which has the salvific Passions as its "only subject." Similarly, also, so-called "theological" arguments put forward that even the memorial services of those who have "fallen asleep" fit into the feast's atmosphere of the Cross and Resurrection, as a reminder of death and rising and not as a cause of mourning, are unsound and weak for overturning the Church's tradition and taxis in the present case. It is imperative that the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross be preserved undiluted by funereal elements, in order that its service is also chanted "undiluted."[1243]

## 490

**In temples that are dedicated in the name of the Resurrection of the Lord, what apolytikion is said in place of the apolytikion of the saint of the temple and when is it chanted?**

The first thought would be to turn to "Christ is risen...."[1244] However, I think that it is not appropriate to chant this troparion as an apolytikion, both because more precisely it is not one and because in any case its chanting is proper to and characterizes Pascha and the Paschal period. During Sundays and during the weeks of the Pentēkostarion, although in some manner the celebration of Pascha

1242. "ὡς μὴ δυνατὸν συντελεῖσθαι τῇ Ὑψώσει."
1243. "ἀμιγῶς."
1244. "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη..."

is continued, the resurrectional apolytikia of the eight tones are provided cyclically as apolytikia, but "Christ is risen..." serves as an ephymnion rather than an apolytikion, just as during Renewal Week. The extension of the practice of the Pentēkostarion to the period outside of the period of Pentecost for temples that are dedicated in the name of the Resurrection would certainly be the most recommended solution. Namely, the chanting of the resurrectional apolytikion of the given tone of the week would also ensure the relative stability that liturgical use requires and the determination of the apolytikion would also ensure at the same time also some relative variety with the change of the eight tones. Moreover, this is also done in the temple of the Resurrection in Jerusalem, which constituted the model to imitate for construction of temples by the same name throughout the ecumene.

In a few temples in order that the possible confusion be avoided that the change of tones causes, mainly in the use of the apolytikion outside of the temple and from memory, and for greater stability, they prefer the troparion of the second tone, "When they who with Mary came anticipating the dawn...,"[1245] an hypakoē or kathisma of Pascha. The boundaries between apolytikia and kathismata are not very watertight in our hymnological tradition. However, the above troparion is especially both long and difficult for memorization, and for this reason, during its chanting as an hypakoē, the people only repeated its conclusion, "For he is the Son of God...."[1246] Conversely, the resurrectional apolytikia of the eight tones are more well known, shorter, easier, and rhythmical for chanting.

When shall it be chanted? In any case not during feasts of the Lord and during their afterfeast days, just as it is also done in other temples that are dedicated in the name of other feasts of the Lord. Similarly, it will also be omitted during the service of the typika of the weekdays of Great Lent, since its resurrectional content is not consistent with the penitential character of these days. Finally, in the sequence of apolytikia after the entrance during Liturgies outside of Sunday, even resurrectional, it should come after the apolytikia

1245. "Προλαβοῦσαι τὸν ὄρθρον αἱ περὶ Μαριάμ..."
1246. "Ὑπάρχει γὰρ Θεοῦ Υἱός..."

of the day, just as it again is done in temples that are dedicated in the name of the Transfiguration of the Savior, of the Nativity, and so forth.

## 491

**What does the Typikon mean in certain cases where it records that the canon is chanted "without a verse"[1247]? Namely, is nothing chanted before the troparia? Neither "Glory to you, our God, glory to you"[1248] nor something other? And why?[1249]**

To understand this standard rubric correctly, we must refer to the original purpose of the canons and the aim of their inclusion in the Church's daily office. Namely, we will recall a few well-known, but somewhat neglected matters in present-day practice, which are considered self-evident, without them being so in reality.

Now, as is well known, the canons are systems of troparia, which had as their original and main purpose to adorn the stichologia of the odes of the Psalter during the service of the monastic Matins. The precise parallel as to their liturgical use is found in the stichēra of the Lamp-lighting psalms, the four psalms of Vespers (Psalms 140, 141, 129, and 116), and of the three psalms of lauds (Psalms 148, 149, and 150), according to the system that survived up until nowadays in the monasteries and partially also in parish temples. Namely, all the verses of the four Lamp-lighting psalms and all the verses of the three psalms of lauds are chanted in the tone of the first stichēron or the first group of stichēra, which are provided for each time by our liturgical books, and the troparia are inserted at the last ten, eight, six, or four verses. The stichologia of the psalms is always concluded with the so-called "small" doxology, the "Glory to the Father…both now…,"[1250] at which the two last or the single last troparion from the groups of the stichēra of lauds or the kekragaria are likewise inserted, according to the standard guidance in force on each occasion. Precisely the same thing must also be expected regarding each

1247. "ἄνευ στίχου."
1248. "Δόξα σοι, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, δόξα σοι."
1249. See question 584 for a summary of the discussion that follows.
1250. "Δόξα Πατρί… καὶ νῦν…"

one of the nine odes of the Psalter, with the only difference that the troparia that are intended for each one do not have complete independence in relation to the troparia of the other odes, as the troparia of Lamp-lighting and lauds, but a relative one, inasmuch as they all belong to the same single poetic composition, the canon. Just as at "Lord, I have cried to you..."[1251] and at "Let everything that has breath...,"[1252] thus also here, all the verses of the odes were chanted—namely, for each ode separately, and, at its eight, six, or four last verses, the troparia of the canon or the canons were inserted, which the Typikon provided for, always with the "Glory...both now..." at the end. This taxis, which must be the original as regards this phase of the development of the Church's daily office, applies in theory, just as it is found published in the Hōrologion and in an appendix of the Psalter with the nine odes. See there, the rubrics in-between, "For eight verses," "For six verses," "For four verses," which exist for each ode except the second, for which another system of stichologia applied or the rubrics were dropped after the omission prevailed of the second ode and that of its corresponding troparia from the old nine-ode canons.

However, the great number of odes (nine, or eight after the omission of the second ode) and their length, especially the dimensions that the service took on with the addition to the odes of the chanting of the canons, caused various abbreviations and modifications even in the practice of the most rigorous monasteries. The verses of the odes were reduced to the number of the troparia, with the omission of the intermediary verses (many or few) from each ode, as we see them being printed in the service books[1253] of stichologia in current use. They are chanted in this manner nowadays in monasteries that observe the Typikon more strictly. Namely, the corresponding verse from each ode of the Psalter always precedes the chanting of each troparion of every single ode, just as it is done with the stichēra of Lamp-lighting and lauds. Certainly, in practice other simplifications also took place, such as the reading beforehand of the verses

1251. "Κύριε ἐκέκραξα πρὸς σέ..."
1252. "Πᾶσα πνοή..."
1253. "φυλλάδες."

of the odes and the group chanting or even reading of the canons, as almost always takes place in parishes during Great Lent, or even other adjustments, which facilitate the conducting of the service, but essentially damage its smooth and orderly course, if not also overturning the whole system of the stichologia of the odes/canons by making the system unrecognizable.

When then the Typikon refers to "verses,"[1254] it does not mean anything other than the verses of the odes of the Psalter, for which every single ode of the canon is intended. However, the Typikon does not specify more precisely, because it considers this self-evident, as it is also in theory.

However, there are instances, in which the odes of the Psalter are not recited. A prime and foremost such case is Pascha and by extension the entire Renewal Week. The Psalter "is absent"[1255] at that time and the stichologia of its odes and the troparia of the canon are chanted without the verses of the odes, "without verses."[1256] In any case, it is worth noting that this—namely, the omission of the verses—does not also extend to the troparia of Vespers and lauds. There, the first two verses are chanted, the ones in-between are omitted, and the last verses according to the number of the stichēra are chanted before the troparia. It appears then that also for the odes something similar was originally done and the old rubrics have this meaning, which are found scattered in the old Typika, such as "We do not say, 'Let us sing to the Lord,'[1257] but we begin immediately from the heirmos" or "And immediately triōdion, in the plagal of the second tone, 'To you I rise up early.'[1258] We begin this from this heirmos, not saying, 'Lord our God.'[1259] And we do this, twelve troparia for each single ode with 'Glory both now,'" and so forth. The latter rubric comes from the Typikon of the Monastery of the Savior in Messina, from the year 1131 and concerns the triōdion

1254. "στίχους."
1255. "σχολάζει."
1256. "ἄνευ στίχων."
1257. "Ἄσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ..."
1258. "Πρὸς σὲ ὀρθρίζω..."
1259. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν."

of Kosmas[1260] from the Matins of Great Friday (fifth, eighth, and ninth odes).[1261] The first rubric ("We do not say, 'Let us sing to the Lord'...") relates to a full canon, which consequently begins from the first ode, and is encountered more often in various Typika on days where the Psalter "is absent." It is, I think, clear that on these days the intermediary verses of the odes were omitted, but the last ones remained for the chanting of the troparia of the canons, such as for "Lord, I have cried to you" and "Let everything that has breath." The heirmos in the canons replaced the chanting of the first verses. The omission of all the verses of the odes and the chanting of the canons "without a verse" does not appear to be the original practice, but is in any case a quite old custom, as the existing liturgical evidence demonstrates.

Consequently, during Pascha and during Renewal Week, the canon without the verses of the odes is chanted, but always with the propsalma, "Glory to your holy Resurrection, O Lord"[1262] for every troparion. The Typikon means this, when it records "without a verse," namely, without the stichologia of the odes.

This custom of omitting the biblical odes, as simpler and more practical, later also extended in imitation of Pascha to other feasts of the Lord, feasts of the Theotokos, and gradually even to saints being celebrated. As a propsalma, a phrase was used depending on the kind of the canon, such as, "Glory to you, our God, glory to you" for those of the Lord, "Most holy Theotokos, save us"[1263] for those of the Mother of God, "Have mercy on me, O God, have mercy on me"[1264] for penitential ones, "O Saint of God, intercede for us"[1265] for canons of the saints, and similar things. These concern the service of Matins, where we have stichologia of the odes of the Psalter, and the

1260. Saint Kosmas the Hymnographer (ca. 675–ca. 752).

1261. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 237.

1262. "Δόξα τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἀναστάσει σου, Κύριε."

1263. "Ὑπεραγία Θεοτόκε, σῶσον ἡμᾶς."

1264. "Ἐλέησόν με, ὁ Θεός ἐλέησόν με."

1265. "Ἅγιε τοῦ Θεοῦ, πρέσβευε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν."

canons as adorning elements in some fashion of the stichologia of the odes, with which their chanting is interwoven.

However, canons were chanted also apart, namely, from the stichologia of the Psalter's odes, which is only particular to Matins. Thus, canons as independent poetic compositions were gradually also introduced into other services, which did not have stichologia, such as into the Midnight Office of Sunday and, mainly, into Complines and monastic processions. Similarly, in services that were structured according to the model of Matins, such as the Paraklēseis, the funeral service, the memorial services, the service of unction, the service of the Small Hagiasmos (partially, because it had a ninth ode alone), the service for holy communion, and others, canons were chanted without the stichologia of the odes, precisely since they were not services of Matins or at least early used them individually and independent of the common morning service. Thus, also during them, the canons were chanted without verses of odes, but with the same or similar propsalmata for them that we saw in the festal Matins services, such as "Glory to you, our God, glory to you," "O Master Christ, have mercy on your servants,"[1266] "O Master Christ, give rest to the souls of your servants,"[1267] and similar ones. The same thing also took place in the same services with the stichēra of Vespers and lauds, where again in imitation of Matins they had been added to them. And these were chanted with propsalmata depending on the canons and not with the verses of Lamp-lighting or of lauds, precisely because this was not about a service of Vespers or Matins.

This practice of monasteries was also imitated in the parishes, even when the latter observed the archaic "asmatic" parish Typikon, because the monastic canons were loved by the people and imparted a special adaptability to the subjects of the day and flexibility to the rigorous and archaic form of the "asmatic" service. It appears that firstly canons of feasts were introduced into the "asmatic" service of the Pannychis, which was celebrated during the first hours of the night, like a small vigil,[1268] on great feasts and for celebrated saints.

1266. "Δέσποτα Χριστέ, ἐλέησον τοὺς δούλους σου."
1267. "Δέσποτα Χριστέ, ἀνάπαυσον τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν δούλων σου."
1268. "μικρὴ ἀγρυπνία."

About the end of the Byzantine period, Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki (d. 1429) during the reform of the "asmatic" Typikon of Saint Sophia that he attempted, introduced the canons into the service of the "asmatic" Matins "that the hearing of the multitudes might be healed upon encountering the ethos of the melody of the canons, and this is simply a necessary measure," "for the adornment...and for good order of the Church, both for the glory of God and his saints" (*Ekthesis*, *Dialogue*, chapter 351).[1269] The canons were chanted in this way "as a Paraklēsis," without the verses of the odes, but with propsalmata that were based on what was referenced above. Moreover, this good order of the service required the prefixing of propsalmata or verses to the troparia both of the monastic and later of the parish daily office. The chanting of the prefixed verse or of the propsalma was indispensable, namely, also for technical reasons, in order to cover the shifting of the canonarch[1270] from one choir to the other. The canons were always done with kanonarchēma.[1271]

When the use of the monastic Typikon spread to them, the practice of the parishes followed the same easy route, namely, the chanting of the troparia of the canon without the verses of the odes, but with propsalmata. The complex system of the stichologia of the odes in connection with the troparia of the canons perhaps was never implemented in them. However, the same custom also became prevalent in many monasteries, or rather in all of them, and was expanded to all the days of the year. Certainly, commendable exceptions were never lacking, as happened in certain monasteries of the Holy Mountain, which up until nowadays strictly observe the old taxis of the stichologia.

However, in the Typika, which continue to consider the ancient practice in force, namely that the canons of Matins are chanted to-

1269. See the translation and text of the *Ekthesis* passage in Alexander Lingas, *Sunday Matins in the Byzantine Cathedral Rite: Music and Liturgy* (Ph.D. diss., The University of British Columbia, 1986), 200. The *Dialogue* text is found in PG 155:643a.

1270. A precentor known as a canonarch (κανονάρχης) who does a step-by-step recitation of the hymns before they are chanted and shifts from one choir to the other while doing so.

1271. The step-by-step recitation of the hymns before they are chanted.

gether with the odes of the Psalter, the old rubrics were preserved, which pertained to when the canons "without a verse" of the odes are chanted on the great feasts of the Lord, which are provided for by the more ancient practice. In this way, confusion was caused for those who did not have the knowledge and experience of the old system. "Verses"[1272] were understood to be the propsalmata and not the verses of the odes. Thus, the misinterpretation became prevalent among them that when the Typikon records "without a verse," the canons are chanted without propsalmata, meaning, the troparia alone, a thing completely inappropriate and unknown to our tradition. The troparia of the canons are never chanted without a verse of the odes or without a propsalma. Since the old standard rubric "without a verse" is misunderstood, the modern Typika ought to either clarify it or even omit it completely, given that this is now systematically misinterpreted.

## 492

**Does the deacon or the priest always say before the ninth ode of Matins, "The Theotokos and mother of the light..."[1273] even when the "More honorable"[1274] is also not chanted with stichologia?**

In parishes during the service of Matins, the deacon (or the priest) always says, "The Theotokos and mother of the light let us magnify honoring in hymns,"[1275] before the ninth ode, whether the "More honorable" is chanted with stichologia or the canon alone or the canons of the feast are chanted. This takes place only in the services of Matins and not when canons are chanted in other services, structured or not, in imitation of Matins, such as in the Paraklēseis, in unction, in the Great Canon when it is chanted in Compline, in the

1272. "στίχοι."

1273. "Τὴν Θεοτόκον καὶ μητέρα τοῦ φωτός..."

1274. "Τὴν τιμιωτέραν..." The full hymn reads, "Τὴν τιμιωτέραν τῶν Χερουβίμ, καὶ ἐνδοξοτέραν, ἀσυγκρίτως τῶν Σεραφίμ, τὴν ἀδιαφθόρως Θεὸν Λόγον τεκοῦσαν, τὴν ὄντως Θεοτόκον, σὲ μεγαλύνομεν" (More honorable than the Cherubim, beyond compare than the Seraphim; who without corruption bore God the Word, truly the Theotokos, you do we magnify).

1275. "Τὴν Θεοτόκον καὶ μητέρα τοῦ φωτὸς ἐν ὕμνοις τιμῶντες μεγαλύνωμεν."

triadika, canons of Sundays, or anywhere else. If ever it takes place, this is a mistake in ignorance or an error. Consequently, the question is confined only to the service of Matins and specific to cases where the "More honorable" is not chanted with stichologia. According to the prevailing taxis nowadays at the Monastery of the Great Lavra in Mount Athos, "The Theotokos..." is not said at that time, but the chanting of the ninth ode of the canons begins immediately from the heirmos. Since the taxis of the Great Lavra is the strictest and most archaic, the question, which indeed comes from the Holy Mountain, acquires a special significance. Namely, it is not as idle as it appears at first glance, nor is it possible for it to be due to a misunderstanding of the standard rubrics or to a modernistic tendency.

From what I know, in the modern Typika, specific clear rubrics do not exist and rather all presuppose the commonly held taxis, which we noted at the beginning. The Great Lavra and a few other monasteries of the Holy Mountain constitute an exception. The *Diataxis of Hierodeaconship*, which "was composed and drawn up by the most holy and ecumenical patriarch lord Philotheos" (beginning of the fourteenth century), which was written by Philotheos at the time when he was still abbot at the Great Lavra, has a very characteristic rubric: "When the eighth [ode] is completed, the deacon sings in a loud voice, 'The Theotokos and mother of the light let us magnify honoring in hymns.' 'More honorable' is chanted with stichologia. But if not [namely, if 'More honorable' is not chanted with stichologia] he chants the beginning of the heirmos of the ninth of the feast."[1276] The fact that this practice must be the original and correct one is gathered on the one hand from the role of the deacon in the service and on the other from the relationship of the ninth ode to the diaconal command, "The Theotokos...." The deacon so oftentimes carries out the function of a master of ceremonies or prompter and, in more ecclesiastical terminology, the 'canonarch.'[1277] Whatever he says has an immediate and organic relationship to the words or the liturgical practice that would follow, for which he gives the command. And the present instance, "The Theotokos and mother of the

1276. PG 154:764c.
1277. "κανονάρχης."

light let us magnify honoring in hymns" (Τὴν Θεοτόκον καὶ μητέρα τοῦ φωτὸς ἐν ὕμνοις τιμῶντες μεγαλύνωμεν) constitutes a command, which even in its wording must be connected with what will be chanted next, which is nothing other than the ode of the Theotokos, which begins precisely from the word, "Magnifies" (Μεγαλύνει).[1278] "The Theotokos..." is nothing other than the ephymnion of the stichologia of the ninth ode according to the "asmatic" Typikon, which originally was shorter, "The Theotokos let us magnify in hymns" (Τὴν Θεοτόκον ἐν ὕμνοις μεγαλύνωμεν), and gradually was expanded with further additions "The Theotokos and mother of the light let us magnify in hymns" (Τὴν Θεοτόκον καὶ μητέρα τοῦ φωτὸς ἐν ὕμνοις μεγαλύνωμεν)—"The Theotokos let us magnify honoring by hymns" (Τὴν Θεοτόκον ὕμνοις τιμῶντες μεγαλύνωμεν), until it attained its present-day form. Then as a type of propsalma or prompt or command, it was said by the deacon in order that the stichologia of the ode for the Theotokos followed. Otherwise, it was not said or, in some manner, the beginning of the heirmos was done with a kanonarchēma. We have a similar intervention of the priest, deacon, or reader again in the "asmatic" Typikon—which is preserved up until nowadays in the Slavic churches—at the beginning of the great doxology. According to the testimony of Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki and the "asmatic" Typika, the reader said the "Glory to God in the highest"[1279] (just as in the Slavic tradition today, "Glory to you who has shone forth the light") from the ambōn and the chanters continued the great doxology. The same thing also here. We find a simplification of the previous rubric in a modern manuscript Typikon (1813) of the Monastery of Philotheou. According to it, when "More honored" is chanted with stichologia, "The Theotokos..." is said first. When it is not chanted with stichologia, the ninth ode of the feast is directly chanted immediately after the eighth: "In the ninth ode, if it is a feast of the Lord or of the mother of God, the 'More honorable' is not chanted with stichologia, but we begin the

1278. The full beginning verse is taken from Luke 1:46: "Μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχή μου τὸν Κύριον, καὶ ἠγαλλίασε τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρι μου" (My soul magnifies the Lord and my spirit rejoice in God my savior).

1279. "Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ."

ninth immediately after the eighth. But if it is a Sunday or commemoration of a saint, the deacon exclaims, 'The Theotokos and mother…' and we chant with stichologia the 'More honorable.'"

However, it appears that this practice gradually fell into disuse and the use of "The Theotokos…" for all cases, whether the "More honorable" was chanted or not chanted, was generalized (not only in the parishes, where the practice always leaned towards easy solutions, but also in the monasteries themselves). For example, in the manuscript Typikon of the Monastery of Hagiou Pavlou, we find the following note very enlightening for the development of this element of the service: "Likewise also in the ninth ode of feasts of the Lord and of the Mother of God, when 'More honorable' is not chanted, neither was 'The Theotokos let us magnify in hymns'[1280] said before the heirmos, which now the deacon exclaims, but it was begun from the heirmos twice."[1281]

The present-day practice is not completely exact but is quite old and has generally become prevalent. For parishes, the intervention of the priest or the deacon before the ninth ode whether the "More honorable" is chanted with stichologia or not, is also practically useful as a calling of attention and an indirect prompt for the people to assume the customary upright posture for prayer. Certainly, when "More honorable" is not chanted, but the ninth ode of the canons, the diaconal intervention is even more necessary. In any case, this instance vindicates the characterization of the Monastery of the Great Lavra as the bulwark of strict and most ancient liturgical taxis and tradition.

As an aside, let it be noted that the intervention of the deacon between the eighth and ninth odes of the canons is also presupposed by the structure itself of the service. Namely, during the chanting of the canons, where it is self-evident that it was interwoven with the stichologia of the corresponding odes of the Psalter ("selecting indeed the last of verses from all these [namely the biblical odes], we appropriately combine them with the hymns that had been composed

1280. "Τὴν Θεοτόκον ἐν ὕμνοις μεγαλύνωμεν."

1281. "ἀλλ' ἤρχετο τὸν εἱρμὸν δίς." Namely, the ninth ode was begun from the heirmos being chanted twice.

by the Fathers, we call them canons,"[1282] according to Saint Markos Eugenikos, *Explanation of the Church's Daily Office*, Concerning the Matins), we have two basic sections: the first between the third and fourth odes and the second between the sixth and the seventh. In the first, a synaptē of the deacon and the priestly exclamation, "For you are our God...,"[1283] are inserted and the mesōdia kathismata or the hypakoē follow. In the second part, again the synaptē and the exclamation, "For you are the king of peace..."[1284] are inserted and the kontakion, oikos, and synaxarion follow. Even on weekdays, when katabasies are not chanted, the pause of the chanting is marked with the repetition of the heirmos from the third and sixth odes, respectively, before the synaptē. In this way, the nine odes are divided into three, so to speak, "staseis,"[1285] three at a time, according to the type of the Holy Trinity. Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki observes, "Therefore, through the canons, as both triumphal and thanksgiving, the Church every day sings these odes in a triple type of the most divine Holy Trinity. And [the Church] makes three staseis in them also in this way honoring the Trinity..." (*Dialogue*, chapter 310).[1286] Thus, we have first, (second), third—fourth, fifth, sixth—seventh, eighth, and ninth odes.[1287]

Between the eighth and ninth odes, there does not exist a synaptē and so forth, because thus the unity of the third stasis would be broken, but there is the indication of a section with the repetition of the heirmos of the eighth ode, with the verse chanted before, "We praise, we bless..."[1288]/a "perissē" or a "prompt." This means that the taxis provides a rather short break (not namely in the form of the two previous ones) obviously "The Theotokos and mother..." or, according to the old rubrics, the kanonarchēma of the heirmos of

1282. Saint Markos Eugenikos, *Ἐξήγησις ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας* [*Explanation of the Church's Daily Office*] (PG 160:1180c).

1283. "Ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ Θεός..."

1284. "Σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ Βασιλεὺς τῆς εἰρήνης..."

1285. "στάσεις."

1286. PG 155:569d.

1287. The "eighth" was not included in the text but is added here to avoid confusion.

1288. "Αἰνοῦμεν, εὐλογοῦμεν..."

the ninth ode if "More honorable" was not provided to be chanted with stichologia. Symeōn also implies this, when writing that "after the eighth [ode] at the beginning of the ninth, he magnifies [Who? From the preceeding, it seems likely the deacon or the priest] the Theotokos who is above all the saints…in the presence of whom he also celebrates with song the things of her divine ode" (*Dialogue*, chapter 312).[1289] Consequently, the intervention of the deacon is well-ordered and expected. The generalization of the "The Theotokos…" is due to the development in a more simplified way of the original more complex practice.

## 493

**During Vespers of Great Friday, is the prokeimenon "They have divided my clothes among themselves…"[1290] chanted or read?**

## 494

**During the funeral service, must the prokeimenon of the epistle, "Blessed is the way…"[1291] be chanted or simply read?**

The prokeimena were created to be chanted and not to be read. Regarding this, there is no doubt, because their original manner of chanting is well known to us from the sources. Moreover, we also know it from their partial survival in present-day practice and from the announcement of the tone that exists in all of them without exception. It is a fact that the development of worship did a great injustice to them. Thus originally the selected verse was chanted—"ὁ προκείμενος" (the preceding) verse of the psalm—and the stichologia of the whole psalm followed, or, if the psalm was long, of se-

1289. PG 155:572b.

1290. "Διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς…" The full prokeimenon reads: "Διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον" (They have divided my garments among themselves, and for my vesture they cast lots).

1291. "Μακαρία ἡ ὁδός…" The full prokeimenon reads: "Μακαρία ἡ ὁδός, ἣ πορεύει σήμερον, ὅτι ἡτοιμάσθη σοι τόπος ἀναπαύσεως" (Blessed is the way wherein you walk today, for a place of repose has been prepared for you).

lected psalmic verses from which the prokeimenon had been taken (this must be the origin of the term: "προκείμενος στίχος" [preceding verse] = "προκείμενον" [prokeimenon]), and the prokeimenon was repeated by the people at each verse. The verses were gradually reduced, until they came to be three, in the so-called "great prokeimena" of feasts and in the resurrectional prokeimenon, "The Lord reigned..."[1292] of Saturday Vespers; and one, the first verse of the psalm from which the stichologia began, if it had not been chosen as a prokeimenon. Thus, the prokeimena—apart from the great ones—came to be chanted nowadays three times, two without a verse and one after the verse of the psalm.[1293]

But development at their expense even proceeded further. Their truncated chanting was preserved in Vespers services throughout the year except for Great Lent, where under pressure of the long service during modern times it became prevalent for them to be read. By extension, in some places, the prokeimenon of Great Friday is also not chanted. And on the weekdays of Lent where the service is celebrated nearly in absentia of the people—we are speaking regarding the parishes—the reading by oikonomia for the shortening of the service is justified. However, not for Great Friday. It is chanted in many places, and I think that it must be chanted everywhere.

As for the prokeimena of the epistle reading, development was unforgiving. It became prevalent for all to be read in the style of the epistle. But as all rules have exceptions, according to the saying, thus also here a sole exception remained: the prokeimenon of the funeral service, which continues to be chanted in some places. It is the only correct instance that remained for us. Let it remain as an island of strictness in a deluge of oikonomia.

1292. "Ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν..."

1293. See questions 307 and 340 for an explanation of the prokeimenon.

## 495

**Before the last or next to the last troparion of the ninth ode of the canons, namely, before "Both now...,"[1294] is "We bless Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the Lord we hymn"[1295] chanted, or "Glory to the Father..."[1296] as in other odes?**

The connection of answer 492 brought us to the present question, which refers to an especially detailed topic, nearly without any practical worth at least for the practice of parishes. However, we are not skipping it for love of the brother who asked and in order that once again the truth of Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki's word shines forth: "nothing is small in the Church of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ; nothing is without reason,[1297] because the Church is the living Word itself. On account of which, with reason[1298] all things are great. Therefore, how does one dare from personal impulses to wholly disregard those things that are reasonable and of God's Word? And to bring himself forward as a legislator for the destruction of these things?" (*Dialogue*, chapter 365).[1299] In our era, especially, such details are considered unworthy of discussion and occupation with them "a waste of time," since only serious and great issues deserve to concern us.

The answer to this question depends on what the end of the eighth biblical ode is, with which the eighth ode of the canons of Matins is chanted according to the original and correct practice. All the other odes are concluded with "Glory to the Father... Both now..." and in this conclusion, two (one at "Glory" and one at "Both now") or one troparion (at "Glory...Both now") are inserted in each case. Accordingly, the eighth ode should also conclude with "Glory...Both now," as also the rest of the odes. However, this analogy caused the confusion that the question implies, which must

1294. "Καὶ νῦν..."

1295. "Εὐλογοῦμεν Πατέρα, Υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, τὸν Κύριον ὑμνοῦμεν."

1296. "Δόξα Πατρί..."

1297. In this sentence, the use of the word "λόγος" is used as "without reason" (δίχα λόγου) and also used to refer to Christ as the "living Word" (ζῶντος Λόγου).

1298. "μετὰ λόγου," namely, with Christ as the "living Word" (ζῶντος Λόγου).

1299. PG 155:680b.

be quite old and is encountered not only in the printed editions, but also in the manuscripts, and very often in current practice. And this, because, as much as it seems inconsistent at first glance, the eighth biblical ode (the hymn of the Three Youths, Daniel 3:34–65) does not conclude with "Glory to the Father...Both now...," but with "We bless Father...Both now...."[1300] This constitutes a peculiarity of this ode. "We bless Father..." is a modification, very successful, of "Glory to the Father...," of the so-called "small" doxology, which was done according to the form of the preceding verses of the ode, which all begin with "Bless ye..." (Εὐλογεῖτε). Certainly, in the manuscripts and in the old Typika, the entire eighth ode is named with this monolectic term ("Εὐλογεῖτε," Bless ye). So, with this conclusion ("We bless...Both now..."), the eighth ode is presented in ancient manuscripts and in less used texts, where the corruption of practice—and of ignorance—has not caught up to spoil them. This happens in the chanting of the eighth ode, according to a singular exception in present-day practice, on Great Saturday at the end of the long series of readings of the Old Testament from the Vespers of Pascha, of the ancient Paschal all-night vigil.

Consequently, when the biblical ode is chanted in conjunction with the eighth of the canon, "we use" (ἱστῶμεν), according to liturgical terminology, "four verses" (εἰς στίχους δ') from the verse, "Bless ye, Ananias..."[1301] and so forth, as the Psalter, Hōrologion, and the Stichologies[1302] continue to note, and we insert the troparia at the two verses that are remaining ("Bless ye Ananias..." and "Bless ye, apostles..."[1303]). We prefix "We bless Father..." to the next to last troparion and "Both now..." to the last one. Thus, the parity of verses and troparia is ensured. Otherwise, with the integration of "We bless Father..." into the ode and repetition again of "Glory to the Father...," the verses are made five, an unacceptable thing. Much worse are the cases of Psalters and Hōrologia, which integrate

1300. "Εὐλογοῦμεν Πατέρα... Καὶ νῦν..."

1301. "Εὐλογεῖτε Ἀνανία..."

1302. "οἱ Στιχολογίες." This term here designates service books (φυλλάδες) of stichologia, namely series of psalmic verses in current use for chanting with troparia.

1303. "Εὐλογεῖτε, Ἀπόστολοι..."

into the ode not only "We bless Father..." without "Both now...," but also the 'perissē,' "We praise, bless...,"[1304] and require, "Glory... Both now." Thus, the mistake becomes more conspicuous: the verses from four become six, from six to eight, and from eight to ten; and the parity of verses and troparia is completely destroyed, since the number of troparia fall short by two the number of verses or conversely, the verses exceed by two the number of troparia.

In the canons of the Triōdion, where the corruption of practice is less as we saw, the verse, "We bless Father...," is prefixed before the next to the last troparion of the last canon (of the triōdion, tetraōdion, and so forth) of the eighth ode, as appropriate, "Both now...," before the last troparion, and, naturally, the verse "We praise..." before the heirmos that is repeated at the end as "a perissē" or "prompt."[1305] There exists no doubt that this is the correct and most precise taxis.

Now let us see a detail of the detail.[1306] When the canon is chanted outside of Matins, where naturally the odes of the Psalter are not recited, then will "Glory to the Father..." or the verse "We bless Father..." be said at the next to the last troparion of the eighth ode? I think that "We bless Father..." no longer has a place. The canon is chanted as a hymnological composition independent of the odes of the Psalter. This is gathered not only from a logical consequence of the matter, but also from the evidence of the Triōdion. Thus, in the canons of the kollyba for the first week of the Fast, the procession of the Sunday of Orthodoxy, the Sunday of Lazarus, and the triōdia of Andreas of Crete for Great Week, which are chanted in Complines, "Glory to the Father..." has the corresponding place.[1307] "We bless Father..." has a place in the Great Canon and in the Akathist, but there this concerns Matins and by extension, obviously by mistake, the same thing is repeated also in the partial chanting of the

1304. "Αἰνοῦμεν, εὐλογοῦμεν..."
1305. "διεγερμός."
1306. "Τώρα ἂς δοῦμε μια λεπτομέρεια τῆς λεπτομερείας."
1307. Saint Andreas of Crete (ca. 660–ca. 740).

former[1308] during the Complines of the first week of the Fast.[1309] In these cases, the perissē with "We praise, bless..." is not also chanted, namely, the heirmos of the eighth ode, and where this provision does exist, it is due rather to a publishing error.

## 496

**Is it permitted for marriages to be celebrated on Saturdays?**

## 497

**Is it permitted for marriages to be celebrated on the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross or on its eve?**

There are no sacred canons that forbid the celebration of marriages on Saturdays and on the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross. According to canon fifty-two of the Local Council in Laodicea (mid-fourth century), "one must not celebrate marriages or birthdays[1310] during Lent,"[1311] because as it is correctly noted in the *Rudder*, "it is a denial of the mourning and fasting of Lent."[1312]

The canon means Great Lent, but by extension it is also implemented for other fasts and on Wednesdays and Fridays of every week. Moreover, the thirteenth canon of Saint Timotheos of Alexandria (late fourth century) prescribes that the spouses, "By necessity...must abstain on Saturday and Sunday because on these days the spiritual sacrifice is offered to the Lord."[1313] It goes without saying that, according to the good customs of that period, they would com-

---

1308. The Great Canon.

1309. Phountoulēs is emphasizing that the Great Canon was intended for use in Matins, and that its use in Complines does not mean that the verse, "We bless Father...," should have been transferred along with the rest of the text.

1310. "γενέθλια." These are the anniversaries of a person's birth.

1311. "οὐ δεῖ ἐν Τεσσαρακοστῇ γάμους ἢ γενέθλια ἐπιτελεῖν," Rhallēs and Potlēs, 3:219.

1312. "εἶναι ἀναιρετικὰ τοῦ πένθους καὶ τῆς νηστείας τῆς Τεσσαρακοστῆς," Ἀγάπιος Ιερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982), 439.

1313. "ἐξ ἀνάγκης...τὸ Σάββατον καὶ τὴν Κυριακὴν ἀπέχεσθαι δεῖ, διὰ τὸ ἐν αὐταῖς τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν ἀναφέρεσθαι τῷ Κυρίῳ," Rhallēs and Potlēs, 4:239. Saint Timotheos of Alexandria (d. 385).

mune during the celebration of the Divine Liturgy. A combination of both the above canons, according to the sober and ascetical tendencies historically held in the Church of the East, also led to the prohibition of the celebration of marriage both on great feasts from their eves, and even on Saturdays and Sundays. Indeed, this took place in some manner customarily, and perhaps was not always applied in practice, at least to the full extent that Saint Nikodēmos wishes to give in the *Rudder*. It was no doubt an excess of piety. Saint Kosmas Aitōlos recommends that Christians celebrate their marriages, "on which day...of the week" they wish, but not on Sunday. And this is the case, "not that the Law prohibits it, but because of the disorders where they take place" and certainly because of the absence from the Divine Liturgy of persons about to be married, and obviously also of their relations, by reason of the impending marriage.[1314] Until recently, most marriages took place unnoticed on Sundays, and there were also weddings on weekdays.[1315] As a matter of fact, official royal weddings were celebrated on Fridays. From what I know, during recent years, the celebration of weddings on Saturdays began to be customary and spread like a kind of "fashion."[1316] Practical and social reasons are cited, which obviously exist. If a special serious spiritual reason existed, the Church should react in time and as a body because otherwise we would arrive at the absurdity and confusion for marriages not to take place elsewhere on Saturday but for them to take place in a neighboring parish, city, or episcopate. Moreover, now it is also too late for anyone to even contemplate the effort of opposition, doomed otherwise to failure.

---

1314. For an alternative translation, see Nomikos Michael Vaporis, ed and trans, *Father Kosmas, the apostle of the poor: The life of St. Kosmas Aitolos, together with an English translation of his teaching and letters* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1977), 75.

1315. Until the early 1980s, Saturday mornings were school days in Greece and Saturday was regarded as a working day by a large segment of the populace. Consequently, Sunday was a popular day for weddings.

1316. "μόδα."

Let the canon of Saint Timotheos of Alexandria be observed by pious Christians. Only, let them pay attention to not falling into the more wicked snare of Satan, namely, to consider themselves righteous, and others, who do their marriages on weekends, sinners. As for priests who bless marriages on Saturdays, let them have the heroism to consider themselves accomplices in the transgression of the canon and of the ascetical customs of the Church. A most misguided action on their behalf would be for them to remind the newlyweds regarding the thirteenth canon of Saint Timotheos, while washing their hands with the illusion that they transfer any responsibilities to the unaccountable young spouses.

As for the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, I have the opinion that the prohibition of the fifty-second canon of the Council in Laodicea absolutely applies. The Exaltation is a second Great Friday, on whatever day of the week it might also fall. Catechized persons about to be married, who wish to celebrate a religious wedding, could also understand this ahead of time. The responsibility rests exclusively upon the priests and is grave and not excused. Moreover, the practical and social reasons for Saturday do not exist on the feast. The Exaltation is only one day a year and Saturdays, fifty-two. As for its eve, at least from the celebration of Vespers you find yourself liturgically on the day of the feast, regarding which the canon of Laodicea applies by extension. However, if we do not wish to hypocritically hide behind the form—the hour of celebrating Vespers—it would not be excessive if we also consider the eve inappropriate for the celebration of marriage. We would then be more consistent and honest regarding the requirement of the thirteenth canon of Saint Timotheos of Alexandria.

## 498

**During Great Lent when we read the services of the Hours, do we begin the Third and the Ninth Hours with the trisagion, as it is in the Hōrologion, or immediately with "Come let us worship"[1317] as it is in the newer printed editions for Lent?**

## 499

**When Vespers is celebrated without the reading of the Ninth Hour having preceded, do we begin with a trisagion or with the "Come let us worship" and the introductory psalm?**

According to the precise taxis, the Midnight Office, the Third Hour, the Ninth Hour, and Compline always begin with "O Heavenly King,"[1318] the trisagion, and so forth. Contrariwise, the First Hour, the Sixth Hour, the Mesōria, and Vespers begin immediately from "Come let us worship."[1319] The reason is obvious. "O Heavenly King," the trisagion, and so forth with which the four referenced services begin, do not belong to them. Namely, they do not constitute an organic element of their framework, such as the trisagion and so forth which are said after the psalms. The former are elements of a small enarxis "introductory" (let us so characterize it) "service," which is placed not particularly before these services, but groups of services, the first of which is the service of the Midnight Office, or the Third Hour, or the Ninth Hour, or Compline. The First Hour, the Sixth Hour, and the Mesōria are always attached to the services that precede, namely the First Hour to the Matins, the Sixth Hour to the Third Hour, Vespers to the Ninth Hour and the Mesōria to the corresponding services of the Hours. Consequently, the enarxis trisagion does not come before them, but they begin immediately from their standard enarxis, namely "Come let us worship." By necessary logical consequence, when the original Typikon provided a break after Matins and after the Third Hour or an independent celebration of every single Hour (just as in the services of the Great

1317. "Δεῦτε προσκυνήσωμεν."
1318. "Βασιλεῦ οὐράνιε."
1319. "Δεῦτε προσκυνήσωμεν."

Hours), each and every Hour, even the First and the Sixth Hours, began with a trisagion just as it is printed in the Triōdion and in the Mēnaia of December and of January.

Namely, in the monastic Typikon, we have seven services for the sacred number of fullness and according to the verse from the Psalms, "seven times a day I praised you for the judgments of your righteousness" (Psalm 118:164); the "seven praises,"[1320] or seven "times of prayer,"[1321] which were originally performed separately. However, for practical reasons according to oikonomia, they were formed later into three groups of services again for the sacredness of the number and according to the verse from the psalms, "evening and morning and at noon I will recount, and I will declare, and He will hear my voice" (Psalm 54:18). Thus, a practical and viable system was formed for a cycle of prayer, work, and rest in three stations (σταθμούς) of the daily cycle, each of which contains, again for the sacredness of the number, three individual services: Midnight Office, Matins, First Hour — Third Hour, Sixth Hour, typika — Ninth Hour, Vespers, Compline. The convention of the new format (3x3) is obvious because neither are the typika numbered among the seven times, nor was Compline attached to Vespers, for trapeza intervened and it was customarily read "in the cells." In any case, the theological interpretation justified it: Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki comments, "And the times of a day and a night are three, the songs of praise are three for each time, just as by three times the Church imitated the mighty Daniel, who prayed to God three times every day, as has been written in the visions [Daniel 6:10]; and by celebrating three services at each of the three times, the Church imitated the nine orders, who are three triads in number and who praise God in song ceaselessly" (*Dialogue*, chapter 328).[1322]

Consequently, each group of services is preceded by "Blessed is our God..."[1323] when a priest is present (or "Through the prayers..."[1324]

---

1320. "ἑπτὰ αἰνέσεις."
1321. "καιροὺς προσευχῆς."
1322. PG 155:593c–593d.
1323. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός..."
1324. "Δι' εὐχῶν..."

in his absence), "O Heavenly King...,"[1325] the trisagion, "All Holy Trinity...,"[1326] and the Lord's Prayer. Saint Symeōn best notes the aim of this introduction to each time of prayer: "Next, they invoke the Holy Spirit to make the prayers perfect and to dwell in, to purify, and to save us. For we do not know what shall be necessary for us to pray unless we are guided by the divine Spirit, since we both live through Him and pray through Him, and Paul states we cry out in Him: 'Abba! Father!' [Rom 8:15–26, Gal 4:6]. Imitating the angels immediately the trisagion and 'Most Holy Trinity' on account of the mercy of the Trinity and the praise equal of the angels and the confession of the only God in Trinity. Next also the prayer that was given by the Lord...And when the priest says the end of the prayer in a doxology, 'Lord have mercy' is said twelve times on account of the twelve hours of the night as well as for the day on account of its twelve hours" (*Dialogue*, chapter 305).[1327]

According to the points above and consistent with the spirit of the Fathers who prefixed these introductory elements at the enarxeis of the times for prayer, and according to the meaning that is given to them, they must only be put before the first service of every single group of services. If services are said consecutively, the introductory elements will be omitted, even if according to the older taxis preserved in printed editions, provision is made for them to be said (Third Hour, Ninth Hour during Great Lent, Great Hours, and so forth). Conversely, and as a consequence to what we said, when "O Heavenly King..." and so forth is not provided for by the older taxis and nowadays this service is celebrated without being attached to another (just as perhaps Matins without the Midnight Office, Vespers without the Ninth Hour), then "O Heavenly King...," the trisagion, and the Lord's Prayer must normally be said after the "Blessed...." At least, tradition teaches this.

The enarxis trisagion in the service of Matins, which constitutes a *sui generis*[1328] case, will concern us in the next answer.

---

1325. "Βασιλεῦ οὐράνιε..."
1326. "Παναγία Τριάς..."
1327. PG 155:557b–557c.
1328. "ἰδιόρρυθμη."

## 500

**Why does the service of Matins have a special enarxis trisagion, while it ought not to have one given that it is appended to the Midnight Office?**

The prefixing of the enarxis trisagion and so forth to the service of Matins constitutes a minor, but complex problem. In principle, the observation is correct, that, since Matins is always appended to the Midnight Office as a second service of the first grouping of the "hymns" of the daily office, consistent with what we know and what we wrote in the preceding answer, it should not constitute an exception, but begin with "Come let us worship...."[1329]

However, here an adventure of entanglement in details begins, which afflicts us on the one hand, but finally illumines the peculiarity of the beginning of Matins. And for us to speak precisely, Matins on weekdays is not the second, but, the third service of the first grouping, because between it and the Midnight Office, the double-psalm service as a Mesōrion is inserted with troparia and the pertinent prayer for those who have "fallen asleep." And this has been joined to the weekday Midnight Office and does not create problems. However, another service has also been permanently added to the beginning of the service of Matins and it creates problems. This is the "trisagion for the kings"[1330] or the "royal service," also with double psalms (Psalm 19 and 20), which is introduced with "Come let us worship..." and contains a trisagion, three troparia ("O Lord save your people..."[1331] and so forth), a synaptē, and an exclamation. The enarxis trisagion that precedes, in every likelihood belongs to it and not to the Matins, because it had in the tradition of the service a relative independence and its position fluctuated at various points of the times for prayer. Again exceptionally, Matins does not have an enarxis with the common, "Come let us worship...," but occupying

1329. "Δεῦτε προσκυνήσωμεν..."
1330. The word, "βασιλεύς, ὁ" can mean "king" or "emperor."
1331. "Σῶσον ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαόν σου..."

its position are "Glory to God in the highest..."[1332] and "Lord, open my lips...,"[1333] which are placed before the Six Psalms.

Namely, in fact, at the enarxis of Matins, we do not strictly have an exception to the rule, but a simple combination originally of foreign elements. This appears clearer in the taxis of vigils, where since the royal service is omitted, the enarxis of Matins, after the reading that is attached to the service of Great Vespers, takes place immediately from "Glory to God in the highest...," namely, arguably from the singular "Come let us worship..." of its enarxis. And in all the other instances, where it appears to us that Matins begins with a trisagion when it is appended to the Midnight Office, the trisagion is not its own, but the central trisagion of the royal service, which is provided for as an enarxis, while it is not, but ends up being one after the omission of the royal psalms.

The case of Clean Monday is somewhat unique. There, Matins has "O Heavenly King..." and a trisagion in its enarxis, because the Midnight Office is omitted "on account of the evening Paraklēsis,"[1334] according to the Typikon of Saint Sabas and the Triōdion. During Great Lent, Matins also again begins with a trisagion, even if it is appended to the Midnight Office, either in imitation of Clean Monday, or because this trisagion must be considered as the introduction of the royal service, which was preserved even after the welding of both services, or, historically more persuasive, because here was preserved in a paradoxical manner—but not uncustomary to divine worship—the imitation of the oldest practice, according to which the Midnight Office was the first part of Matins, and in some manner the existence of the modern Midnight Office is ignored. This also constitutes the easiest explanation for the omission of the Midnight Office during vigils, where it should by logical rationale occupy the central position.

---

1332. "Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ..."

1333. "Κύριε, τὰ χείλη μου ἀνοίξεις..."

1334. Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012), 282. The "Paraklēsis" referenced is most likely the Great Canon of Saint Andreas of Crete, which the Typikon prescribes to be chanted at Compline (see page 294 of the latter work).